THE REVIEWER Reviewed:

OR,

Mr. JOSEPH HACONS Miſtakes in his late NOTES

Upon a

CATECHISME

Compoſed by

J. HORNE, Miniſter of the Word of God *at Lin-Alhallowes* in *Norfolk*.

GEN. 31. 37. What is my treſpaſs? what is my ſin? that thou haſt ſo hotly purſued after me. Whereas thou haſt ſearched all my ſtuffe, what haſt thou found? Set it here before my Brethren, and before thy Brethren, that they may judge betwixt us both.

MATH. 7.5. ——First, caſt out the Beame out of thine own eye, and then ſhalt thou ſee clearly to caſt out the Mote out of thy Brothers.

——Dum alienos errores volunt reprehendere, demonſtrant ſuos. Bern. de curioſitate. Ser. 54.

Tanta vis eſt veteranarum opinionum, & diu defenſæ atque creditæ falſitatis, ut rationem ſequi recuſet. Auguſt.

Superbo oculo veritas non videtur, ſincero patet. Bern.

LONDON, Printed for *Auſtin Rice* and are to be ſold at the Crown in S. *Paules* Church-yard. 1661.


Collegium Sancti Iohannis Evangelistæ
in Academia Cantabrigiensi 1709

Reverendo Doctissimoq; viro

Petro Gunning, Sacrosanctæ

Theologiæ Doctori celeberrimo, & ejusdem

Facultatis Professori Regio, nec non Collegij

Divi Johannis Præfecto, &c; hasce suas quales-

cunq; Catechismi ejusdam sui Primitias,

Johannes Horne, Ecclesiæ omnium

Sanctorum apud Lemenses verbi Divini

dispensator indignus, summæ suæ observantiæ

tesseram ac testimonium, dat, dicat, dedicat.

Anno 1667. Dom:

D

The Preface.

GReat is the goodneſs of the Lord, & his wiſdom wonderfull in all his doings, who by increaſing our exerciſes, increaſes our happineſs: & at once gives us both more advantage againſt our corruptions, & more opportunities for his ſervice, by ordering oppoſitions to us for his ſervice, and by thoſe very oppoſitions againſt the truth, more manifeſts his truth, ſo true is that of Auſt. that God is ſo good and wiſe; that he would not permit evil to be, unleſs he knew how to turn it to good, the Serpent ſhould not be permitted to bruiſe the heel of the womans ſeed, had he not thereby the better advantage to break the Serpents head. As by the ſmiting of the flint with the ſteel, fire is produced, whence we receive both light and heat; ſo by the ſmitings of errour and erring perſons againſt the truth, and them that hold it, the ſparks of truth ſhine forth the more, which doth inlighten our judgement, and warm our affections towards God and goodneſs, and conſumes up nothing but ſin and fleſh; yea both fire and water iſſue out of the flinty rock by its being ſmitten, that is to ſay from Chriſt in himſelf and Members; as to inlighten and warm, ſo to cleanſe and refreſh, and make fruitfull in goodneſs. Oppoſitions, yea, and perſecutions too, though troubleſome to thy fleſh therefore, yet are profitable: yea, therefore profitable, becauſe troubleſome to the fleſh, as well as becauſe incitements and advantages to the Spirit. By being ſo rubb'd we grow the brighter: yea, & the truths we believe are more purged from the duſt, that they contract from us by their being in us; by being ſo heated and burnt we are made the purer; while we looſe our droſs. yea, I may ſay as Scipio Africanus in Enniut, with a little alteration of his words and ſenſe, taking his active Gerund paſſively, viz.

Fas eſt cædendo cælestia ſcandere regna.
By being ſmote and ſlain the way doth ly
To thoſe celeſtiall joys, which are on high.

Therefore I adore Gods providence, in ordering me theſe labours, when I had ſcarce got rid of others, I had but newly finiſhed my diſcourſe about the new Heavens and Earth, and the New Jeruſalem, but theſe oppoſitions with ſome other offences and angers preſently followed, as it were on purpoſe to make me minde my way the better to them, and prepare me for them; oppoſitions, reproaches, ſorrows and ſufferings for Chriſt and his truth, being the road way to them, and beſt preparatives for them. Verily, happy is the man, I ſay not that can ſo

court, and complement, and comply with the world and its fashions, as to gain its applause, and to be well spoken of by all men: but who is counted worthy to be hated of it for the truths sake, and to be dealt with as an evil doer, and endures it patiently rather then to shrink from truth and righteousness. Great is that mans reward in Heaven; For so dealt their Fathers with the Prophets. The way to be received of God, is to come out from the customs, traditions and pollutions of the world in opinion and practise. Lord make me willing to be more brought out from them into thy Son, though I meet with more anger therefore from men, lead me so by thy grace and guide me, that I may walk with an even foot, so as to avoid the extreams of vertue; not break the first or second Commandements under pretence of better keeping the fifth, nor the fifth under pretence of better keeping the first and second, but that in all things I may keep a good conscience both towards thee, and toward men & if because I dare not, or will not defile my conscience, or deny thy truth, men will oppose and hate me, Lord strengthen me to bear it with patience, and thy will be done. As for these Exceptions by my neighbour Minister, to what I have published, Lord I implore thine assistance, that by thy light I may see the darkness either of my own, or opposers sayings and by thy grace avoid the error, and embrace the truth wheresoever I discern it. I shall conclude this preface with that of St. Augustine, *in his proeme to his fifth book about the Trinity. If being in the family of thy Christ, O Lord my God, I sigh or grone amongst thy poor ones, give me of thy bread to answer those men who do not hunger, and thirst for righteousness, but are full and abound, but they are satisfied not with thy truth, which resisting, they fall into their errour, but with their own imaginations, indeed I am sensible how many figments the heart of man brings forth, and what is my heart but a mans heart, but this I desire the God of my heart, that I may utter nothing of those devises of my heart in these my writings for solid truth but may prefer the solid truth of God before all the imaginations of mine own heart.*

In hoc genere hominum in familiâ Christi tui Domine, Deus meus, & inter pauperes tuos gemo, da mihi de pane tuo respondere hominibus, qui non esuriunt & sitiunt justiciam, saciati sunt, & abundant; saciavit autem illos phantasmi eorum, non veritas tua quem repellendo resiliunt, & in suam vanitem cadunt. Ego certe sentio quam multa figmenta pariat cor humanum, & quid est cor meum nisi cor humanum, &c.

The Reviewer Reviewed.

CHAP. I.

In answer to his exceptions to my Epistle.

Sect. 1. MR. *Hacon* (for so is my Antagonists or Reveiwers name) observes a wrong method, he first concludes before he argues and condemns me as an *interpolator veritatis*, Title page, an Huckster of the truth, a remover of the landmarks set by our fore-fathers, and intimately that I have set forth a scathfull Catechisse, p 2. and this before he brings in any proofs or evidence; and therefore I may bring in a writ of errour, or false judgment, and bring the matter to a more lawfull hearing, where I question not but I shall stand unconcluded.

Sect. 2. "That the Articles of religion, confessions of faith and "form of Catechism are the sacred terms and boundaries of particular Churches may be so far granted as they agree with the word of God, and if it be not injurious to the Churches growth or her Members, by tying them to the measure already attained, which had not some Members of our *English* Church, as well as others formerly broken through or gone beyond, when bounded by the Popish Articles, Catechisms and confessions (though with their manifold sufferings from those that bare the name of, and sway in the Church and their adherents,) I suppose we had not as yet had those

Articles and Catechiſmes that are owned by our Churches, however other Miniſters beſides me have compoſed Catechiſmes for the inſtruction of youth, and eſpecially of thoſe under their charge, and why not I, ſ I fear the late Synod went more from the *Engliſh* Catechiſe then mine hath done by far, eſpecially in the points the Reviewer ſticks at.

Sect. 3. His third page, utters this uncharitable ſlander of me, *viz.* "That I dread and deprecate all National eſtabliſhment of re-"ligion, as ſanguinary perſecution. *Reply*, tis falſe; that God eſtabliſh his true religion in this Nation I pray for, and neither dread nor deprecate. Is there no way to build up *Sion* but by blood? or to ſerve religion but by ſanguinary perſecution? for the Nation to eſtabliſh religion is a kind of ἀκυρολογία, an improper ſpeaking, as righteouſneſs exalts a Nation, *Prov.* 14.34. ſo religion, if true, is its eſtabliſhment too, *Iſa.* 33.6. Our help, even the Nations ſtand in the name of the Lord, not its help ſo much in the Nation, though the Nation may and ought to ſerve and further it, and endeavour to preſerve it in its power and purity amongſt them; and ſo I deſire it may do, and not eſtabliſh falſhood for truth, oppoſition to the freeneſs and extent of Gods grace, aſſerted in the Scripture for Orthodoxiſme; idolatry and ſuperſtition, for religion, thoſe things I deprecate, it is the not being content that Chriſt be ſerved in his truth, as he makes it manifeſt, and ſoberly and lovingly ſeeking after it, and bearing with one another where they diſſent, (endeavouring onely by inſtruction, conference and other ſpirituall weapons to convince and further one another therein, and keep out errour) till God give further light, and indifferent uſe of things, indifferent as every man is perſwaded: but under pretence of eſtabliſhing religion to compell all men to believe or profeſs and practiſe the ſame things, whether God hath revealed it to them or not, and for not doing ſo though otherwiſe ſober, pious and peaceable, the perſecuting and puniſhing them; and preſſing and binding burthens of humane ceremonies and traditions, and ſo exerciſing a Lordly domination in the Church of God (as if one ſhould be puniſht, becauſe he cannot ſee or reach ſo far as another, or wear a ſhooe of the ſame ſize) its ſuch beaſtly doing under pretence of Church-power that the voice of the Dragon is in *Rev.* 13. 11. that brings forth ſanguinary perſecution, a power not to edi-

fication

fication but deſtruction, that God gives to no man, and that I pray God to inlighten all mens eyes to ſee the miſtake and miſchief of it; that they might not by driving Chriſts lambs and ſheep either to noxious paſture, or faſter then they can go, wrong and deſtroy them, this I deprecate as no nationall eſtabliſhment of religion, but an eſtabliſhment of a domination in and over the Church, to the overthrow of religion; ſo that that paſſage (while he talkt of limit and order) was without the limits of charity towards me, but perhaps it was one of thoſe paſſages that in a letter to me he cryed *peccavi* in, and therefore I forgive it, for as *Seneca* ſays.

Quem, pœnitet peccaſſe pœne eſt innocens. i. e.
He that repents that he hath done amiſs,
A faultleſs man he almoſt is.

Sect. 4. In p. 4. He faults my title page for ſaying (as may beſt ſerve the capacity of children) unleſs I had omitted what follows, the great myſteries there ſpecified. *Reply.* That phraſe as may beſt ſerve the capacity of children, was not joyned with the great myſteries, but with what went before, *viz.* The anſwers or inſtructions being plainly or briefly laid down, the mention of great myſteries was added as a reaſon why it might be uſefull for the conſideration of men, but may not children learn the great myſteries of redemption, the love of God, the way and means of ſalvation? or is it an abſurdity to inſtruct children in them? then they muſt get no Catechiſmes, for they generally treat of the myſteries of redemption, juſtification, ſanctification, Sacraments, &c. They be taught in the Catechiſme of the Church to ſay, Chriſt redeemed them and all mankind, and the holy Ghoſt ſanctifies them and all the elect people of God; and what a Sacrament is, &c. *Leolychidas* being asked what children ſhould chiefly learn, anſwered, *ea quæ prodeſſe queant virilem ætatem aſſecutis*, thoſe things that might profit them when they come to be men; and are not all the myſteries of religion ſuch, *Solomon* alſo ſays, Train up a child in the way that he ſhould go in and he will not forget it when he is old; inſtruction uſually goes firſt, and underſtanding comes after, as years and exerciſe come upon them, as in all trades and ſciences, the principles wherof they learn young, though while young, they do not well apprehend many of them.

Sect. 5. 'That [they ſhould be betimes prepoſſeſſed with a vile 'opinion of the pretended Orthodox, as that they are of a Satani-'cal perſwaſion, and hold moſt horrible impieties, as *Hannibal* was 'cauſed by his Father to ſwear, while but a youth, againſt the *Ro-'mans*, and all for beleeving Gods free and ſaving grace, and that 'he doth not love all men alike; and to empty their quivers, not 'againſt the *Papiſts*, *Anabaptiſts*, *Socinians*, no danger being fear-'ed from theſe now but the pretended Orthodox] is not rightly ſpoken. 1. Hath he forgot his brethren the *Contra-Remonſtrants* both here and in the Low-Countries, how they uſed to, and yet do fill their tongues and pens, yea, and their hands too with malice againſt their Remonſtrant Brethren? What more riſe with them then the odious Names of *Pelagian*, *Semi-pelagian*, *Arminian*, the enemies of Gods grace, and what not? To ſay nothing of their per-

Epiſt. ad Peuc.

ſecutions beyond the Seas, to the loſs of living, baniſhment, im-priſonment, becauſe as *Melanchthon* ſaid, *à Zenone differrent*, they would not be Stoicks: How many did the late Triers put by from good Livings, becauſe they would not be of their opinions? and am I to be faulted for teaching children without reflecting on any ones perſon, that it is of Satan, to perſwade or blind men to oppoſe the truths of God, that are of ſo needful a conducement as the know-ledge of Chriſts death, for all, which was both the Apoſtles judge-ment, and the right guide thereof, 2 *Cor.* 5. 14, 15. in and through which the love of Chriſt conſtrained them to all their ſervice; and for teaching them, That God is not worſhipped acceptably where his truth and love is not beleeved? Is it not a duty pertaining to the ſame perſon that teaches truth, to arm alſo againſt ſin and error? 2. Do not my Anſwers afford matter too againſt the *Papiſts*, *Anabap-tiſts*, *Socinians*? Yes ſurely, as I dare appeal to himſelf, though from the pretended Orthodox have I had moſt oppoſition, and they were the likelieſt perſons, being then moſt prevalent, to endeavour to per-vert the children and elder men too, from the belief of thoſe Doctrines of truth delivered by me for their inſtruction. Antidotes are chiefeſt to be given againſt the preſent reigning diſeaſes in every age or ſea-ſon; yea, ſhould I not have anſwered, and armed them againſt the arguments of the pretended Orthodox, and ſhewed them the de-ceits and danger of their oppoſite Doctrines, they might have ſaid I had done nothing, and eaſily thrown down, at leaſt in the view of

the

the ignorant all my building; if having sown good seed in my field committed to my charge, I also endeavoured to secure it from the Rooks, and other Birds or Beasts, ready to devour it and me too; am I therefore to be faulted? if he can prove it bad seed let him do it, and I will help to pluck it up again. But 3. That's a broad falshood, that it is for their beleeving Gods free and saving grace, and that he doth not love all men alike, that I teach the children against them; it is for their denying the free grace of God, as the Scripture speaks of its freedom for all, and that saving grace to all men, as saving to all, as *Tit* 2. 11, 12. as what follows in this Treatise I hope will evince: Nor fault I them for saying, God loves not all men alike, for I say so too, he loved *Jacob* more then *Esau*, and the gates of *Sion* more then all the habitations of *Jacob*, and *John* more especially then the other Disciples, *Mal.* 1. 2. *Psal.* 87. 2. *Joh.* 13. 23. but for not saying, but denying that he loves all in truth: False it is that he says again, *p.* 5. that 'I teach the children to give an account 'of the malice that is in them; it was of the malice or evill in their denials of Gods Doctrines asserted by us: But I shall passe the froths of his wit, and ebullitions of his frowardness, more to shew his reading, then of any force against the truth or goodness in the instructions of my Catechisme.

Sect. 6. I said in my Epistle that I varied from the common road of the pretended Orthodox, because they leave the Scripture road, and walk in a b path of the Elders traditions, and I would have my Auditors with my self, not walk by Vote, but by Rule, the word of God. To this πολλοι μεν ναρθηκοφοροι, παυροι δε βακχοι: He gives many fine words to no purpose, as that the road is not to be forsaken, because common, multitude is the Papists mist (he may say so, because not brought up under them) and paucity the Anabaptists, &c. in which he commits a Fallacy of *non causam pro causâ*, for I said nothing of leaving the road because common, but because it leaves Gods Word, he should have disproved that, would he have said any thing to purpose; his Suppositions prove nothing, either that many Nobles are cordial beleevers, or that men now a dayes flie as a cloud of doves to the windowes, God grant it be so; and that we had ground to read that Scripture, *Matth.* 7. 13. otherwise then of old, *viz.* that *broad is the way, and wide the gate that leads to life, and many go in thereat*, if such a thing may be wished; but if it be so, yet my saying

ing is right enough that I would not walk by vote nor by mans precepts but by the word of God; he that is angry with that saying hath either not so good an eye or honest an heart as a Reveiwer should have. He says, "vote and the rule of Gods word may be "not contrary but subordinate. *Reply.* Be it so, yet would I nor walk by vote but by the word still though in walking by the word, I should in that case walk with the vote. A man that travailes from *Lin* to *Ailsome* may go much of his way in *Norwich* road, yet he goes not in it because its *Norwich* road, but because it is his way to *Ailsome*, I deny not that the thirty nine Articles are, or the Assemblies Catechisme and confession might have been framed, according to the rule of Gods word in the points in difference, and be voted too, but that therefore if so I am to follow them because voted, follows not, but because they agree with Gods word. He addes

Sect. 7. "If a single Pastor write a Catechisme, and frame An-"swers that he would have his Parishioners to learn and get by heart, "are they not now taught by the precept and appointment of men? "is there not as much lording and dominion over the faith of o-"thers in a Parish, or small Congregation, as in a Diocesse, Province "or Nation? *Resp.* Precept and appointment may be two waies understood, as to its object, either Gods word commanded also by man to be observed, or mens traditions that Gods word teaches not, commanded and appointed by men. The former is not like the latter, nor to be confounded with it; and again in respect of the manner of commanding or appointing, it may be either ministeriall, a willing or desiring, as a minister of God, without compulsion, or binding their consciences otherwise then the word of God and its authority produced by him binds them; and authoritatively and compulsively, so as not giving such liberty of dissent, or of assenting only so far as the word perswades them. Now I say, if a single Pastor either propose his own thoughts and devises, which Gods word warrant not, or enjoyn his sayings by a compulsive force, as suspending punishing, &c. in case of dissent then he may be as guilty of the faults mentioned for the extent of his jurisdiction, as a Diocesse, Province or Nation, but otherwise not: is it all one to teach and to impose? to help their faith, and exercise their dominion over it? to teach men with *Abraham* to keep Gods statutes, and lay-

ing

ing by Gods word to obtrude what is contrary, or ſwarves from it? I ſuſpend none for not following my deſires therein, I am willing to teach them this or the Church Catechiſme, or both, as they are willing to learn, I allow them liberty, yea, I will my Pariſhioners or Auditours to enquire and try if any thing I ſay ſwerve from Gods word, and if ſo, to let it alone; yea, if they be not ſatisfied about it, not to reſt in it, becauſe I ſay it, but to wait upon God in minding the Scriptures, and walking in what they are ſatisfied in, till God if it be truth, as I believe it is, reveal the ſame alſo to them. I would there were no other kind of lording it over mens faith or worſhip, deſired or exerciſed in this Nation, I deſire with meekneſſe to inſtruct, not with violence to inforce. What follows too is falſe then, *viz.* "That ſhould we in earneſt walk after this tradition here plainly taught and delivered, we muſt multiply our Creeds according to the number of our heads, and every ſeveral perſon have a form of faith by himſelf, which contradicts his former ſaying; for if it lead every man to have a ſeveral Creed how lords it over the pariſh to make them all of the miniſters Creed, nay, rather while we are inſtructed all of us not to have our fear toward God taught by the precepts of men, as *Iſa.* 29. 13. but every one to mind the word of God, and cleave only to what he underſtands to be delivered by him (unto the uuderſtanding of which, yet the miniſtry of man and his gifts conduce to bring men) we are inſtructed to have all but one faith or Creed, that is, the word of God; however there may be different latitudes in mens apprehenſions of that one. But it behoves every man to have that Creed at leaſt, as to the eſſentials of it himſelf as his own Creed, and not to have his faith like that of the *Romaniſts*, depend on other men, to believe only implicitely as the Church believes, which is the thing I lead my Pariſhioners from.

It is a good Rule of St. Auguſtine, Quicquid hominum quantumvis docti & ſancti ſinguli ſeorſim, vel conjuncti, etiam univerſi ſtatuerint; non ideo tamen verum credi debet, quia ab ipſis ita ſtatutum eſt. ſed quia quod ſtatuerint, certis etiam Scripturis ac rationibus comprobaverint.

Sect. 8. "That the moſt judicious ſort of my charge and neighbourhood (as he ſaies he believes) yea, and very children of any capacity will think it ſafer in matters of difference to follow the judgement of many pious learned men, then of one, though he were equally gifted with the beſt of them) is probably true, unleſſe they ſee more evidence of truth in the ones, then in the manies ſaying, and then one *Paphnutius* may outweigh a whole Counſel of learned Biſhops. It is not my ſaying but Gods that I would have preferred

before

before all pious and learned men that swerve therefrom. But what? are there not many pious and learned men too of my judgement? I trust there be, though the truth is neither to be concluded from the multitude nor paucity of professours, but from the word of God, which sometime is with one, and not with many; with which while I said I hoped they should find what I presented clearly to agree, I submitted it to their tryal, and imposed not authoritatively upon them. while men see no better then by comparing men with men, I cannot expect they should prefer the fewer to the more, except upon clear evidence on the fewers side, and that often weighs against the more, yea will, with all that seek and love the truth rather then mans applause and honour. I would have men resolve their faith, neither into the fewer nor more, nor into the learning or piety of the one or other, but trying all things till they finde where Gods word speaks, then to resolve their faith only into his authority, All this while then he hath but fought with his shadow, nor was it any dust raised by me about any point, but the light of the truths I held forth meeting perhaps with the weakness of his eye-sight, or their disaffection, that made him to feel some smart and take it for dust.

Sect. 9. He taxes me as grourdlesly with injuriously, charging my adversaries with broad denial of the Scripture sayings; because they interpret one sentence by another, and are unwilling to make use of the particle *all*, and every one therewith to overthrow the contents of the Gospel, and as with an helve and an handle to cut down the choice tree of the forest, an acute charge like helves and handles that use to cut; what I charge as a broad deniall of Scripture sayings is such as these, that Christ died not for all, nor for every man, dyed onely for the elect, would not that all men be saved, that these be broad denials of the Scripture sayings any that know what the Scripture saye can tell, and that the men of an opposite judgement use to say so, they know that have read their books and remember their sayings, false it is then that I either injure them in so charging them, or that I therefore so charge them because they interpret one sentence by another, 'tis rather for that they not believing those Scripture sayings misinterpret also others, or interpret them by others, of no relation to them or by inferences that follow not there from, nor will the belief of those Scripture sayings that say Christ dyed for all and every man, according to the pro-

por-

per notion of thoſe particles, either overthrow the contents of the Goſpel, or lead thereto, as his own taking the particle *all* *p.*56. as I do, and diſtinguiſhing the word *for*, and the whole body of my Catechiſme clearly argues. As for the trees of the foreſt, tis no hurt if the choice of them be cut down to prepare a way for the Lord there through; for the foreſt or wilderneſs of the world is full of the trees and thickets of errours and miſtakes, were the choice of them cut down, it would be never the worſe for the vineyard. But

Sect. 10. He charges me with but, talking of the Scripture-road, becauſe I ſaid in my *Eſſays*, that thoſe words *Acts* 13.48. were no part of *Pauls* doctrine by him then preached, but onely an aſſertion of *Luke* the writer of the Apoſtles *Acts*; and I ſaid (but he thought that was beſides his purpoſe to mention it) that we may not think that *Luke* meant contrary to *Pauls* doctrine, that he fraudulently ſuppreſſed, but I added indeed, that in caſe he ſhould (not as mine, but as a ſuppoſition rather flowing from the ſenſe mine adverſaries, as he calls them, put upon his ſayings) then its ſafer to ſtick to *Paul* the Apoſtle and teacher of the Gentiles, but I concluded that there was no need to think they diſagreed; well, what is there faulty in all this? what flying from the Scripture-ſaying in it, which I alſo after largely explicated? whether *Luke* relate that as *Pauls* ſaying or his own, I appeal to Mr. *Hacon* himſelf, or whether we may ſuppoſe that *Luke* would diſagree with *Paul*, or whether in caſe that might be ſuppoſed, 'it be not ſafer to ſtick to *Paul*, who ſays, if we or an Angel from Heaven preach any other then we have preached, let him be accurſed; or whether *Lukes* ſaying may not be ſo interpreted as to agree with *Pauls* doctrine then and at all times; yea, ought not ſo to be in all theſe things I dare appeal to Mr. *Hacon* himſelf alſo, where then is the faults? or where the flinching from the Scripture-road?

Sect. 11. But he implies, I will not ſtick to *Paul* neither, becauſe I ſay that that "diſcourſe of his in *Rom.*9. is of thoſe places "hard to be underſtood that S. *Peter* ſpeaks of 2 *Pet.* 3.16. well, how doth that imply that I will not ſtick to his ſayings? may I not ſtick to his ſayings, and yet 'ſay they be hard to be underſtood? did the Apoſtle flinch from the ſaying of *David*, *Pſal.* 110.3. thou art a Prieſt for ever after the Order of *Melchiſedeck*, becauſe he ſaid of it there be many things thereabout hard to be underſtood,

 *Heb.*5.11.

*Heb.*5.11. Surely not, or ſaid I falſe in ſo ſaying? that ſome of *Pauls* ſayings be hard to be underſtood, is the Apoſtle *Peters*, and therefore true, that thoſe paſſages about election be ſuch Mr. *Hacon* implies in faulting me for putting ſuch great myſteries into a childrens Catechiſe, for as for the myſteries of redemption, faith, works, Law, Goſpel, what Catechiſme almoſt but treats of them? was it not of election, predeſtination, reprobation, he ſaid, if this be milk what is ſtrong meat? now certain it is that *Rom* 9. ſpeaks of thoſe points, therefore it muſt be of the harder things, unleſs the milk be harder then the ſtrong meat; yea, doth not *Pauls* own exclamation toward the cloſe of that diſcourſe Chap. 11. 13. ὦ βάθος. ὁ the depth of the riches, &c. plainly argue, that theſe things there treated of were moſt profound and deep? again do they not refer theſe things to Gods ſecret will, but the redemption to the revealed? and muſt they not then be according to them the harder to be underſtood? let *Calvin* himſelf be heard, and he will tell us that the queſtions about predeſtination, are *magnæ & arduæ*, great and difficult, and at the beſt that the diſpute about it is *aliquantum impedita*, ſomewhat intricate, and thence he faults *Eckius*, for ſaying he writ of it in his youthfull time, *ut puriles calores exerceret*, to exerciſe therein his younger heats, and *Origen* ſays, thoſe words of hardening *Pharaoh*, troubled almoſt all the Readers both that believe the Scriptures, and that believe them nor, yea, and the Apoſtle *Peter* adding that ſaying of the difficulty of ſome things in *Pauls* Epiſtles next after his willing them to account; the long-ſuffering of the Lord ſalvation as *Paul* alſo had written to them; what ſhould he more properly mean, then that ſuch things in his Epiſtles, as ſeem to the unlearned and unſtable to claſh with that account of Gods long-ſuffering; are hard to be underſtood, but be that Chapter hard or eaſie, doth my ſaying its hard to be underſtood argue that I wave it, when I explicated the ſumme of that Chapter immediately after, and ſhewed its conſiſtency with generall redemption? ſo then what he adds, *viz.* That I have bethought my ſelf how I may eaſily anſwer all that can be brought againſt me, &c. for if the argument be hard, then the place whence it is taken, is hard to be underſtood, and it muſt be ſuppoſed not to be rightly underſtood, ſo long as it ſhall ſeem to croſs the univerſalliſts, and ſo that inſtead of walking by others vote, I plainly and peremptorily walk

by

χάριν πάντας τὸς ἐντυγχάνοντας ταράσσειν τὸς πεπιστευκότας δυσὶ καὶ τὸς πιστεύειν λέγοντας. Orig. Philocal. c. 27.

" by my own will, and without regard or heed-taking wreſt to my " purpoſe that very Scripture that warns us of the fearful danger " of wreſting any, is odiouſly ſpoken; for that was not all the Anſwer I gave, to ſay the place was hard to be underſtood, as his words would ſuggeſt; nor was that the firſt time I had anſwered to thoſe Arguments, my Catechize had ſpoken to them before without any ſuch ſaying; nor was there any argument propounded to me by any in that diſcourſe from that place eaſie or hard, that I needed to have ſaid any thing to, but as for others helpfulneſs I offered it of my ſelf; I laid down that indeed as a premiſe, that it being of the things hard to be underſtood, is not to be made the rule of expounding more plain ſayings, ſuch as are milk for babes; as, that God the Son redeemed all mankind, and this is no new Obſervation, for *Ariſtotle* and all Logicians tell us, that the right method of finding out, or demonſtrating things, is to proceed *à notioribus ad magis ignota*, from things more known to things more hidden, but not on the contrary; yea who is there that doth not lay down or beleeve ſome things plain and fundamental, contrary to which no difficult ſaying is to be interpreted, becauſe it would be againſt the Analogie of Faith; ſo the Proteſtants ſay that ſaying, *This is my body*, is not rightly interpreted, when its interpreted contrary to this Article, he is on the right hand of God there expecting till all his foes be made his footſtool; and can any thing be more Fundamental then the Goſpel to be preached to the world for their converſion? as that is in 1 *Tim.* 2. 4, 5, 6. *God wills that all be ſaved*, &c. *Chriſt gave himſelf a ranſome for all*, &c. yea, do they not themſelves take this courſe more irrationally, finding out, and deviſing ſtrange diſtinctions about the will of God, and the meaning of the words *all*, and *every one*, and *for*, &c. becauſe thoſe ſayings of the Goſpel they think may not be rightly underſtood, if interpreted contrary to their apprehenſions of theſe Scriptures that ſpeak of Election and Reprobation; only the conteſt is between us, whether ſhould be the more Fundamental matters of Faith, the plainer and eaſier, to which the reſt are to be reduced, and by which interpreted; we ſay the Goſpel to be preached to all, and they ſay the myſteries of Election and Reprobation, the ſtrong meat underſtood by few: I walked not then by my own will, nor wreſted the Scriptures that warn of wreſting them, but ſhewed how theſe

men wreſt them againſt the firſt principles of the Goſpel, to their own and others harm.

Sect. 12. I ſaid what I offered might boldly look my worſt adverſaries in the face, to which he ſays, *Thats not alwaies the beſt, that looks the boldeſt*; True, but beſides my ſaying, its one thing to look boldly, another that it may do ſo, many things do ſo that have no ground for it, truth only may do ſo, though error often is confident with the fool and rages; nor doth that ſaying imply, that there is nothing of humane frailty in what I have written, but only nothing of poiſon or unwholſome. If humane frailty hinder Chriſtian boldneſs, to look the worſt adverſary in the face, there ſhould be no ſuch boldneſs in the world; the man that hath his quiver full of thoſe arrows ſpoken of *Pſal.* 127 is not ſuppoſed to be without humane frailties, yet need not be aſhamed when he meets with the adverſary in the gate: It is true, he that is firſt in his own cauſe ſeems juſt, but his neighbour comes and ſearches him out: to which ſearch of me, Mr. *H.* is come: I may ſay to him as *Jacob* to *Laban*, Gen. 31.37. *Quanam tranſgreſſio mea? cum perſcrutatus, es omnia quid invenisti? pone hic coram fratribus meis, & fratribus tuis, ut judicent inter nos*; whereas thou haſt ſearched all my Anſwers, what haſt thou found? ſet it here before my brethren, and before thy brethren, and let them judge between us; but I may ſay of all hitherto as the man of the Nightingale, which when he came to eat, he found no meat on it, that here is *Vox & praterea nihil*, big words and bitter cenſures, but nothing of ſolidity againſt any thing ſaid by me.

Sect. 13. As for his favour and connivance, as I expect them not in his following *Examen*, ſo his Encomiums of all but what he miſlikes, as ſtriking againſt his conceptions are in no danger to pride me, for though they may ſeem to lift me up high, yet it is but to give me the greater downfall, as I was the more dangerous deceiver, and huckſterer of the Word, and had done ſo well in many things, to do the worſe in ſome, and to convey poiſon with the leſſe ſuſpition, after ſome more wholſome doſes, as his praiſes make me not the better, ſo neither do his Inſinuations of greateſt diſpraiſe, and deepeſt Pharaſaiſm make me the worſe, he tells me of a Box of ointment I have given out, but there be ſuch dead Flies in it as

ſpoil

ſpoil it all, and he will do the friendly Office to pick them out: I ſhall thank him for that, if he put in none of his own, in ſtead of picking ſome out as mine: Well, he hath hitherto made his flouriſh, though very deſperately, condemning me deeply before he hath proved me guilty, likely to prepoſſeſſe the Readers minds that taking it for granted, that I am ſome notorious deceiver, they may conclude his Premiſes right without due examination, becauſe his Concluſion is ſo confident; the Lord deliver us from ſuch Judges as condemn before they try, and ſuffer us not to have the matters of Religion eſtabliſht in ſuch mens hands as will pronounce us Hereticks becauſe we diſſent from them, before they have ſeen what may be ſaid for our Vindication.

Thus much to his *Velitatio* or forlorn hope; come we now to joyn iſſue about the Catechiſme it ſelf in the following Exceptions.

CHAP. II.

Except. 1. *To my firſt Anſwer about the Word Creators.*

Sect. 1. HE begins where I began, and taxes my mentioning the word Creators of novelty and ſcandal; novelty as a word never heard of before he thinks in our Churches. *Rep.* I ſhall put him in minde where he may read it, *Viz.* in *Ainſworth* upon *Pſal.* 149. He tranſlates the like word plurally thus: *Let Iſrael rejoyce in his makers*, and then notes upon it thus: His makers 'the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghoſt, which three are one, 'the myſtery of the Trinity is in the Hebrew Phraſe, ſo in many 'others, as *Let us make man in our image*, Gen. 1. 26. *Where is God 'my Makers*, Job 35. 10. *Thy makers is thy husbands*, Iſai. 54. 5. *Re-'member thy Creators*, Eccleſ 12. 1. and ſundry the like, ſo *Ainſworth*: See then it was a word heard of long before my Catechiſm was thought of; and whatever he ſays, 'All the Chriſtian Chnrches have been forbid by the Catholike Faith to ſay, yet they never forbad us

to

to read that Scripture *Eccleſ.* 12. 1. in the Hebrew tongue, or to turn it into Engliſh according to its proper force or Idiome, which ſo often as we read, we read that very word he faults me for in that language; yea, and the Hebrew children were taught by *Solomon* many hundreds of years before I was born, to ſpeak of our Creator plurally, and I did no more; the thing is the ſame in ſubſtance, though the ſound of the words be different: So *Zanchy* reads, *Pſal.* 149. 2. *in factoribus ſuis*, that is in Latine, in his Makers, and what differs that from Creators? As for the Hebrew Grammars, and their rules, ſeeing we Chriſtians beleeve the Trinity of Perſons in the Divine Eſſence; we may know a further reaſon of the Prophets to ſpeak plurally of God, then only the Idiome of their tongue, as the Jews that deny that would have it, and ſome Chriſtians from them; nor have we only words of Dominion in the plural form according to that Rule, but other expreſſions not to be brought within its compaſs; not only Makers and Creators never uſed plurally that I remember but of God, nor only *faciamus hominem, Let us make man*; and that manner of ſpeech to himſelf too, never ſo uſed by any in Dominion that is but a ſingle perſon (nor do any uſe to ſay of one King, let us obey our Kings) but beſides we have in *Gen.* 3. 18. *Behold, the man is become* מִמֶּנּוּ *like one of us*; and can that be ſpoken only from the Hebrew Idiome, of one perſon alone ſpeaking to himſelf? nor is that Rule the Rule of all the Hebrews: *Rabbi Ben-Ezra*, as *Zanchy* tells us, ſays, that the plural number is uſed to ſignifie Dignity only in the ſecond and third perſons, not in the firſt; and that *Galatinus* cites many *Rabbins*, and they alſo of moſt account, that ſo interpret that word *Elohim*. He that will may ſee more to that purpoſe in *Zanchy lib.* 1. *cap.* 1. *De creatione hominis.*

Pluralem numerum ad ſignificandum dignitatem tantum in ſecundâ & tertiâ perſonâ, non autem in primâ in ſcripturis uſurpari.

Sect. 2. As for the ſcandal, there is none given by me, ſeeing I expreſly only avouch thence the unity of God in the Trinity of perſons, which is done without novelty or ſcandal by many others; nay rather, it may be matter of ſcandal, that Chriſtians ſhould ſo Judaize, as to withhold ſuch intimations of the Trinity, frequent in the writings of the Old Teſtament, in ſuch words and phraſes of plural form, and putting it off with a bare Hebraiſme and Idiom of ſpeech. And I ſhould rather think, that from the plural form of

the

the word *Elohim*, attributed to God upon the account of the Trinity; the ſame word otherwiſe applied, is ſometime alſo, though more rarely uſed, than that, becauſe its ſometime ſo uſed of others, to think therefore its but an idiome of their ſpeech; but no more to that.

CHAP. III.

Exception 2. *To Anſwer 25.*

His next Exception is againſt my Anſwer 25. Becauſe I ſay there are ſome luſts of the fleſh not ſinful, as the deſires proceeding from the weakneſſe and needs of nature merely, &c. "To this after ſome "wandrings of his wit, he ſayes (in brief) that I "miſtake the *Engliſh* Catechiſme, about the word "(fleſh) as the work of God, or created nature, whereas they take "it for the corruption of nature, and added the word (ſinful) on-"ly as an Epithite, and not by way of diſtinction, as I miſtake it, this is the ſumme of it. To which I ſay; be it ſo, the matter is not material, my Anſwer is true, that there be luſts of the fleſh, ſuch as I mentioned, that are lawful, but I did indeed, and yet do look upon the word ſinful, not only as an Epithite, but alſo by way of diſtinction. My reaſon is; For if they by fleſh mean only the corrupted nature, then ſhould they have taught children to renounce it, as himſelf ſayes. "Our three enemies to be renounced and fought a-"gainſt, are the world, the fleſh, and the Devil. But they teach not children to renounce either fleſh, or world, but the pomp and vanities of the wicked world, and all the ſinfull luſts of the fleſh, when the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the fleſh in that ſenſe, as it ſignifies, corrupted nature, he ſpeaks not only of denying its luſts, but its ſelf alſo; they that are Chriſts have crucified the fleſh with the affections and luſts of it, *Gal.* 5. 24. Make no proviſion for the fleſh to fulfill the luſts of it. *Rom.* 13, 14. If ye walk after the fleſh, ye ſhall die, *Rom.* 8. 13. Would the Catechiſme have us kill the brats, and ſave the damme alive?

He here forgot that of *Iſocrates*, τοῖς μεγάλας τὰς ὑποχὰς ποιουμένοις. ὑπόπτως χρὴ περὶ μικρὰ διατρίβειν. that men that promiſe great matters, ſhould not trifle about toyes.

live? We are taught to renounce not the works of the Devil only, but the Devil alſo; why not alſo the other two enemies, the world and the fleſh, had the framers of the Catechiſme meant as Mr. *Hacon* ſayes, I conceive, they thought rather, that little children are not capable of diſtinguiſhing the different ſenſes of world, and fleſh, nor intended they to give them any nice diſtinctions of them; and ſo they might think, ſhould they renounce the world, they muſt go out of the world, and ſhould they renounce the fleſh, that they muſt *abuti carne*, offer violence, or injuries to their bodies, and taking things ſo in the groſſe, as we are to renounce the vanity and wickedneſſe of the world, yet neither are the things nor perſons of it ſimply to be renounced, (yea, the perſons of it, though our enemies are not to be renounced as the Devil is, but we are to endeavour their good): ſo alſo the fleſh in its confuſed ſignification, as it takes in both the body of man, and the ſin that dwells in it, is not to be renounced, but only the luſts of it; yea, not all the luſts of it, as it ſignifies moſt ordinarily the body, but thoſe that are ſinful, as ſpringing from the corruption in it, and all ſuch are ſinful; yea, and the ſinful luſts of the corrupted diſpoſition in us, bee of the natural body too many of them; For as *Tertullian* ſayes, the fleſh is faulted in the Scriptures, becauſe the ſoul is nothing without the fleſh in the works or operations of luſt, gluttony, drunkenneſſe, cruelty, idolatry, &c. thence in the Poets too we find

——*Corpus ſuperbum*;
Obſequium ventris mihi perniciosius, &c.——

And many the like; now becauſe many of the luſts, or deſires of the body, or fleſh, as ſo taken alſo, are ſinful, yet, not all; therefore alſo might it be ſaid with diſtinction of thoſe luſts, as well as by way of Epithite of all the luſts of the corrupt diſpoſition, that all the ſinful luſts of the fleſh are to be renounced.

Hic (Sathanas) eſt, qui manus noſtras proprio gulo alligat, & ut dicitur, baculo noſtro nos cædit; ut caro, quæ data eſt in adjutorium in ruinam nobis & laqueum fiat. *Bern.*

Caro igitur increpatur in Scripturis, quia nihil anima ſine carne in operationibus libidinis, gulæ, vinolentiæ, ſævitiæ, idololatriæ &c. *Tertul. de anima*,

CHAP.

C. I. V.

His 3. Exception is to the margin of Anſwer 40.



IN the Margin, over againſt Qu. and Anſ. 40. I noted that the tree forbidden to *Adam*, was called the tree of Knowledge, of good and evil, becauſe God therein would try whether man would do good or evil, and *Adam* had diſtinction therein of good and evil. To that he tells us, "Good and evil do not ſignifie "duty and ſin, but happineſſe and miſery, and "knowledge here experience, or woful experience of good by [illegible] and by the ſenſe of it. [illegible] who told him [illegible] that the word and evill there ſignifies only miſery and [illegible] only ſignifie both, and in both I mean it, that *Adam* [illegible] on [illegible] and evill; ſo that here he miſ- takes [illegible] agreed upon by all; for I aſſert ſaid [illegible] of the good or duty [illegible] of good and evil [illegible] the tree it might, and ſtrictly ſpeaking [illegible]) or had it been elſe upon the will of voluntate [illegible] ſaying [illegible] might have been true, divine [illegible] reaſon the [illegible] quarrel any thing, [illegible] *invidia* [illegible], he will [illegible] ſenſe [illegible] there in giving the moſt in ſenſe [illegible] will [illegible] ſay, this re- [illegible] are [illegible] referre [illegible] ſo if God [illegible] know what man [illegible] a man be [illegible] one [illegible] o a [illegible]

So Zanchy thought too, lib. 2. cap. 1. de Creat. hom. fide.

vagary of the *Socinians*, denying the divine prescience, as if there was
to examples of that horrible errour in my expression, wherein I
greatly tax Mr. *Bacon* with want of Ingenuity, doth this saying,
God would try *Adam* whether he would do good or evil, imply that
he did not know what he would do before? how follows that?
did not God try *Abraham*? yes, he cannot deny it, yea and said, now
I know that thou fearest God, *Gen.* 22. 12. might he not fault that
phrase too, as implying that God did not know till then, so in *Gen.*
18. 20, 21. its said the Lord said because the cry of *Sodom* and *Go-*
morrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous, I will go down
and see whether they have done all together according to the cry
of it, which is come unto me, and if not I will know, and again in
Deut. 13. 3. The Lord doth prove or try you whether you love the
Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul; do
not these places speak in such language as I used, or rather more
favouring of such a conceit as he suspects me guilty of? doth not
his charge then fall upon these Scriptures too, that [illegible] of
that corrupt mind, to think that God knows not contingent mat-
ters before they come to pass? ah but the [illegible] *trabes*
in his owne
eye [illegible] the mote of prejudice or beam of [illegible] in his
eye towards me, or some evil humors of some such [illegible] have
obfuscated his sight that he judges of all things, according to that
intus existent humors, and not according to their own colours. I
think an indifferent child may conceive, that he that tries another,
may sometimes know before he tries him what he will do much
more than God can, and as for making more figurative locutions
I made none more in the Scripture by so saying, I hope he would
not have the children think that the tree knew good and evil or bare
such fruit on it, and that God did therein try and know in such
manner as [illegible] is attributed to him, that is, that
he had [illegible] would do; not certain, and
why it might not upon [illegible] account also have that name given it;
I am yet to learn. I find *Polycarpus Lyserus* a *German* divine of great
learning and repute jump with [illegible] reason of its name. He
[illegible] noted as having their
foundation in the Scripture, [illegible] of God that he would
try *Adam* by this tree, and know whether he would abide good by
obeying, or become evill by disobeying: for (addes he) though God
know

Simpliciores has duas notas, quæ sundamentum habent in Scriptura, unam respectu Dei, quod nimirum Deus sub-evidentiam in his arbore probare & noscere, alteram respectu hominis, quod per obedientiam bonum se esse, & per inobedientiam malum se esse, experiatur.

Polycarp. Lyser. in Gen.

know all, even future things, yet he uſes ſo to ſpeak when he tryes a man, as concerning *Abraham*, &c. the ſecond in reſpect of man for he by it ſhould know good or evil, &c. yea and *Tertullian*, though he aſſert God's fore-knowledge againſt *Marcion* yet uſes that phraſe upon that account, *non excludens ſed probans libertatem de obſequio ſponte præſtando*, l 3. c. 5. that God excluded not, but tryed *Adams* liberty touching the obedience to be voluntarily performed by him. What irreligious principles they that plead for their liberty of will are forced to maintain, I know not; nor would the ſtory of *Puccius* have done well in a Catechiſe for children if it be true. I ſee what evill principles ſome that ſeem to plead againſt it run into by this; namely to calumniate, forge and ſlander, and abuſe the moſt innocent expreſſions, but alas he was fatally carried to it; but I ſuppoſe not from any neceſſity as from God, but from the abundance of that prejudice againſt my perſonal doctrine, that is in him, ſurely, though God needed not try *Adam*, that he himſelf might learn what he would do, yet *Adam* came actually to know his own folly and weakneſſe by that tryal, and what it was to ſin againſt him, but I fear this gentleman is [illegible] from thinking that God did not know before, that he the[illegible]ored and neceſſitated *Adam* ſo to ſin, would I follow his courſe in faſtening upon him the ſayings and judgements of other men of his mind, I might find paſſages enough to that purpoſe in many of them to render him and his opinions odious, but Mr. *Pierce* hath done it ſo fully that I ſhall but *actum agere*, do what is done already, and therefore I ſhall leave the reader for that to him, I ſtudy brevity.

D CHAP. V.

CHAP. V.

His 4. Except. Is to Qu. and Anſ. 86,87,88,102.

Sect. 1. FOurthly, he faults my Anſwers about Chriſts preparing and offering up himſelf, as the acceptable ſacrifice; the preparation of which I aſcribed to his work on earth, but the offering it as a Prieſt to his aſcent into Heaven. To which he excepts, 'that the preparatives to Chriſts "ſacrifice of himſelf, we may call thoſe "infirmities that he took upon him with his ſupplications, ſtrong "cries and tears, &c. But that his ſacrifice ſhould be prepared in "earth and offered in Heaven, is a new peice of learning, &c. *Reply.* He comes not fully up to my ſaying or ſence, I ſaid not he prepared himſelf to be the ſacrifice, but he prepared himſelf the ſacrifice, or as the ſacrifice to be offered up, nor ſaid I he offered himſelf in Heaven, but in his aſcending into Heaven. To underſtand this the better, obſerve

Sect. 2. 1. That to be a ſacrifice or to be ſacrificed, and to offer up the ſacrifice differ, the one being paſſive, the ſacrificed, the other active and the Prieſts part, yea, to ſacrifice may be larger then to offer the ſacrifice, as containing in it the whole action, even the preparation of it too; though ſometime to offer a ſacrifice may ſignifie as largely as to ſacrifice. But

2. Strictly, the offering of the ſacrifice was either the act of the man for whom it was offered, bringing it and offering it to the Prieſt before the ſlaying of it, as is to be ſeen, *Levit.* 1.3. and 3.1. 6. &c. or elſe of the Prieſt, and that was after it was ſlain, as in *Lev.* 1,7,8,9,13. and 3.3.9,10,11. and 16,24. cauſing the ſavour of it to go up by fire toward Heaven, wherein God is ſaid to ſmell a ſavour in it.

3. It was of the offering of the ſacrifice as the Prieſtly action, as alſo of the preparation of it as a Prieſtly action, that I ſpake as is evident, and though Chriſt alſo offered himſelf, as typed by the parties

parties bringing the sacrifices and offering is to the Priests, for we could not bring him our selves for our selves, yet I rather look upon that as the preparation of the sacrifice to the offering of it by that Priestly action, which was properly his offering it after the death of it; for all that went before that was but preparing it to that offering, not simply to its being sacrificed, for that includes the killing too, as Christ our passover, 1 Cor. 5. was slain or sacrificed for us, but to the oblation or offering of it.

4. I distinguish of Christ as a Priest and as the sacrifice, though he was both, yet in diverse respects, and so his preparatives might be diversly considered.

Sect. 3. Now I say according to the types to which I had reference, all his acts as it were upon himself before his offering up himself; or the odour of his slain, yea, and raised body (In which he went beyond all other sacrifices, they being dead sacrifices, but he the living sacrifice yet as a Lamb that was slain he was offered up) were but preparatives to that, though also acts of sacrificing as the slaying, washing, dividing of the typicall sacrifices were, and so I say not onely his being weak, &c. but also his yielding up himself to dye, and suffer in those infirmities bearing, yea, humbling himself and obeying to the death, though acts of sacrificing and of the sacrifice offering it self to be sacrificed, yet were but preparatory to his Priestly oblation strictly so called, in which he with the vertues of his own blood and sufferings, went up to God, and was in the eternall spirit the true altar and fiery love of it, carried up into Heaven a spotlesse sacrifice as having found redemption, from &c. for the sins he suffered under unto death, in his resurrection, so that I may ask out of what shop comes the offering up of the sacrifice in its proper sence before his death? the Articles of the Church of *England* are alledged, which though I reverence yet I distinguish them from the Holy Scriptures, having learnt with *Austin* to give that reverence onely to the Holy canonicall Scriptures, to be the Canon of faith and doctrine, but I take it the Church of *England* may stand well enough with the Scriptures, and with what I say, taking the word offering in its largest sense, so as to include those other preparatory acts to that speciall one, nor doth our Saviours saying it is finished, say any more that he did not offer up himself in his ascension, then that he had done so in his prayer, when

he ſaid before his ſuffering, I have finiſhed the work that thou gaveſt me to do upon the earth; but that ſaying rather referred to his Agony tending to his dying, or to his meriting the atonement, and ſo *Col.*2.14. of blotting out the hand-writing, and nailing it on the Croſs ſignifies, that by the vertues of his ſufferings thereon ſuſtained, the redemption was obtained by him, as typically it was by the death of the ſacrifice, though the oblation followed after, as in *Levit.*16. but that nothing more needed to be done for perfecting the ſacrifice and expiation (except in that ſenſe I ſpake of as to its preparation) appears not thence, for its ſaid, had not Chriſt riſen again we had been yet in our ſins, and we had had no reconciliation and forgiveneſs by him, 1 *Cor.*15.17,18. yea, had he not aſcended the comforter could not have come, nor could we have had peace and comfort with God, or liberty to Heaven; ſo then as the High Prieſt made an atonement for the people with the blood of the ſlain Goat, before he offered it up in the utmoſt act of offering it, and yet is ſaid to make the atonement in that too as the perfecting act of it, *Levit.* 16.16.24. ſo Chriſt was truely ſaid to take away our ſin in his Croſs or ſufferings, and yet our ſin had not been fully expiated had he not riſen and aſcended, for having made a purgation of our ſins by himſelf, he ſat down on the right hand of God *Heb.*1.3. yea, how did his ſacrifice purge the heavenly things themſelves, but by his entring in once by his own blood into the heavens, as *Heb.*9,23. where alſo in *verſe* 26. his offering himſelf is made by the Apoſtle to anſwer to the High Prieſts, entring once into the holy place the figure of the heavens, yea, when he ſays *verſe* 23,24. Chriſt is not entred into the holy places made with hands, but into Heaven it ſelf, nor yet that he ſhould offer himſelf often, *&c.* implies not that plainly that he entred in thither to offer himſelf once? that in *verſe* 29. ſo Chriſt was once offered to bear the ſins of many, may be underſtood of Chriſt offering himſelf as the repreſentative of the people offering, or as the ſacrifice yielding up it ſelf, though ſome underſtand it otherwiſe, that he offered up himſelf as the High Prieſt entring the holy of holies, to bear the ſins of many, as the High Prieſt himſelf was ſaid in another ſenſe to bear the iniquity of their holy things, by being holineſs to the Lord for them, made to us holineſs 1 *Cor.*1.30. with *Exod.*36.38. but I ſpake onely of the offering up the ſacrifice as Prieſt, which alſo was called *Gnolah*, aſcenſion, becauſe

becauſe of its aſcending towards Heaven by fire.

Sect. 4. He ſays, "the Altar was the Croſs, a common ſaying but a very great miſtake, I wonder they think not of that of our Saviour, *Matth.*23.19 yea fools and blind, whether is greater the gift, or the Altar that ſanctifies the gift? by which rule they make the Croſs greater then Chriſt as ſanctifying him, and then good reaſon have the Papiſts to adore the Croſs with the ſame divine worſhip as they do Chriſt; or rather with greater, ſure the Altar upon which he offered up himſelf, was the divine nature, or eternall ſpirit burning him with its fervent charity and love, carrying him up unto God, and cauſing him to devote himſelf to him for ever, nor is his note right from "*Heb.*9.26.28.*viz.* that to ſuffer, offer and dye in this caſe are made "the very ſame thing, a groſſe miſtake, to offer was active, to ſuffer and dye was paſſive; indeed if he had offered himſelf often, he muſt have ſuffered often too, not becauſe to ſuffer was to offer, but becauſe the ſacrifice (it a living creature) alwaies ſuffered and dyed, before it was offered up by the Prieſt a ſacrifice by fire, as is before ſhewed, the miſtakes of his following queries from common ſpeech and ſenſe needs no more to be ſaid to them, the killing and eating of the paſſeover come not up to the buſineſſe, for it was not offered to make an atonement that I finde, there were indeed paſſoever offerings, but not of the Lamb, but of Bullocks offered at the feaſt, as 2 *Chron.*35.7, 8, 9. To *Heb.*8, 1, 2, 3, 4. quoted by me he ſpeaks many things to no purpoſe, and begs the queſtion inſtead of proving any thing againſt me, talkes as if Chriſt onely offered up ſome ſervices and not himſelf, in his going up into the heavens, having finiſhed his ſacrifice on earth, all which *ingratis dictum*, and agrees not with what the ſame Apoſtle ſays, Chap.9.23, 24, 25, 26. as we noted above, where his offering up himſelf is made to anſwer to the High Prieſts, entring into the holy place with blood of others; how he had found eternal redemption was touched upon before, therefore I paſſe to his next exception.

CHAP. VI.

CHAP. VI.

Excellencies of Christ as he is the head of the Church.

Sect. 1. 

Elchia to Ruffus and Asser 160. 161. where I said, Jesus Christ is the onely Head and Lord of the Church; though he substituted others for helps of government and usefulness therein, and that either for more inward growth and helpfulness as Apostles, Prophets, &c. or for outward order as Bishops or Elders and Deacons. To which he first distinguishes of the Church into visible and "invisible, and Catholick or general and particular Churches, and "says it should seem I mean of the Catholick Church visible. Reply. I mean it indeed of the Catholick either visible or invisible, as in diverse respects it is both, as the whole eye is a spiritual society that person may be seen nor their Church also that frame of the mind is visible, and the Church invisible not always seen, yet much more the holy ghostly (even then the Catholick Church is always visible though not always seen) [illegible] tells "us of the Catholick invisible Church, Christ is the only head and "Lord, but he hath not substituted any in his [illegible] vicarium spi- [illegible] the holy ghostly [illegible] head or Lord over it, but is [illegible] Christ [illegible] of no [illegible] his [illegible] no, neither holy [illegible] substituted none as head, [illegible] substituted his Apostles & Pro- [illegible] the gospel to the world, and [illegible] holy ghost in the in- [illegible] Christs [illegible] of calling dead [illegible] out of my box of ointment as he pretended he is throwing [illegible] and prefers the [illegible] perpetual and ordinary

ordinary, becauſe (he ſayes) "the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts did govern ourd-
"wardly, and the Biſhops and Elders did teach and feed the flock of God.
"for inward growth and helpfulneſſe, *Act.* 20.28. 1 *Pet.* 5.2. *Rep.* So alſo did the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts teach, and the Teachers might prophecie, 1 *Cor.* 14. 3, 31. yet that notwithſtanding the Apoſtle divides them the one from the other; when he ſays, God hath ſet in his Church firſt Apoſtles, ſecondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers, in 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *And he hath given ſome Apoſtles, ſome Prophets, ſome Evangeliſts, ſome Paſtors and Teachers,* Eph. 4. 11. where alſo in the next verſe he might have found, that thoſe he calls Extraordinary and Temporary, are (as to their uſefulneſſe) of perpetual ſtanding, *till we all come in the unity of the faith to a perfect man.* So that my diſtinction likes me as well as that uſual one, it being found in the Scriptures, as *Eph.* 4. 11. 1 *Tim.* 3. and the main ends of their Inſtitution being ſo diſtinguiſhed as I diſtinguiſhed them; though (as in the Apoſtles diſtinction,) the works of them, yea, and the Offices too, might be found together in the ſame perſons.

Sect. 3. He ſayes of the Catholick Church viſible, in ſome ſort "Chriſt "is the Head, but more properly he is Head of that body whereof he is the "Saviour. *Rep.* Who elſe is Head of the Catholick Church viſible? or is Chriſt the Head of any man or body in every ſort? or is not he alſo the Saviour of the Catholick Church viſible, who is the Saviour of all men, eſpecially of them that beleeve? The Apoſtle ſays, there is one body and one Lord: and Mr. *Hac.* would have him Head of two bodies; which have alſo divers other Lords. He may as well ſay, a heap of wheat in the chaffe, is two heaps, one in the chaffe, and another out of it.

Sect. 4. But he addes, That he hath reaſon to think that I did not intend "in this place ſo much to exclude the Biſhop of *Rome*, from being the ſpi-"ritual Head of the Chriſtian world, as to exclude the Chriſtian Magiſtrate "from ruling in a National or any particular Church. To which he adds "ſome Excurſions about the Titles of Head, and Lord of the Church, as at-"tributed to Kings, and about their incenſurableneſſe, as being not chil-"dren, but Fathers of particular Churches. The former part of which ſmells of blood, and a deſire to harm me: the latter of flattery, and perhaps a good minde to a good Prebendſhip. God preſerve me from the former, and ſend him the latter, and much happineſſe with it, if it be good for him. But againſt the former.

——*Hic murus aheneus eſto*
Nil conſcire ſibi; nullâ pallеſcere culpâ.
A clear and guiltleſſe conſcience, without ſenſe
Of fault, is like a brazen wall or fence.

I bleſſe God, I know my ſelf clear from having ſaid or done any thing that argues ſuch affection to the Biſhop of *Romes* pretenſions; or ſuch leſſe af-

 fection

fection to the Christian Magistrates just Authority in Church-matters, as my Adversary would here insinuate what I said, in asserting Christ the only Head and Lord of his Church, is no more then every good Protestant and Christian believes and judges him worthy of. They that quarrel at that, whether out of their little affection to Christ, or flatterie to Princes, or a minde rather to pick a quarrel with me, are not so good Christians as they should be. And if Christ say to them another day, as in *Hos.*13.10. where is thy King, let him save thee, or thy Vindices, of whom thou saidest, Give me a King and Princes, it will be but sad with them, when he so judges them. As for the Title Head of the Church. (though too much for any mortal man in its proper, notion yet) as Archbishop *Cranmer* explicated it to Dr *Martin*, who can deny it? when the Doctor asked him who is the Head of the Church, the Archbishop answered, Christ And the Doctor replying, But ye made King *Henry* the eighth Supreme Head of it. He answered, yea, of all the people of *England*, as well Ecclesiastical as Temporal. And again, Christ is the only Head of his Church, and of the faith and religion of it: the King is Head and Governour of his people, which is a visible Church; yet I think they have done well to leave that terme out of the oath; to prevent offending and scrupling mens consciences, and the more they do so the better. For, for the people to swear with a doubting conscience, or to what they apprehend not true, is neither good for the people, or them that impose it upon them, nor for the Nation, whose happinesse cannot be increased by the peoples sinning. It is good for Rulers in all such cases, to tender their subjects as their brethren, and as the price of the blood of Christ who died for them. And to that purpose to meditate the Law and Doctrine of God and Christ, as *Deut.*17.18,19,20. and to beware of flatterers, who have the poison of Aspes under their lips and kill insensibly and unsuspected; and therefore are a more dangerous kind of enemie, then (though not so frightful, as) open rebels, as *Dalilah* did *Sampson* more hurt then the Philistines, without her, could have done him. Truly, I think by Mr. *Hac.* principles, *Samuel* was too blame to refuse to turn again with *Saul*, and to go to visit him after his rebellion against God, that being a kinde of severe censure of him. And the Priests of the Lord in *Uzziah*'s time, and Saint *Ambrose* in *Theodosius* time were sawcy fellows for dealing as they did with their Soveraignes, not remembring that they were their Fathers, yet I am neither for the Popes Bulls, nor the Scotch Presbytery.

Acts and Monum Vol. 3. p. 662.

CHAP. VII.

Except. 6. *About the Power of the Magistrate in Religion.*

ON this subject he thought good to make his next Exception to *Ans.*287. because in treating about the duties of several relations, not their

Powers

powers. I did not impertinently step out of my road to determine the Power of Magistrates in matters of Religion. And from my silence, in that he judges his Negative Argument will hold good, "that I beleeve it not, nor would have it taught. *Rep.* 'Of what force such negative Arguments are, others that know what belong to Arguments may judge. At that rate I might conclude, that Mr. *Hacon* knows not how and in what sort Christ is head of the visible Church, because he hath not told us, he might have seen by one of my proofs that mentions godlinesse, and by my saying he is to the utmost of his power to endeavour the peace and welfare of his people, that I beleeve he hath some power about Religion; except neither godlinesse nor the peoples welfare have to do therewith. His insinuations, "as if I had a teeming head, "and go big with new fancies, care not much for the Magistrates intermed-"ling in the Church, and matters of faith, but am ready to cry out of sacri-"ledge and incroachment upon Christs Royal office (for which it seems Mr. *Hac-n* is neither so jealous, nor so zealous as for the Magistrate, though we are far more ingaged to him, and he far abler to protect, reward, or punish us) have much of disdain and malice in them, his negative Argument would have done better here [he never by word or writing found me guilty of such sayings, therefore I am not chargeable with them] then where it is.

Sect. 2. He alledges as a colour for that malicious slander, a passage out of the Preface to my *Open Door*, wherein I retorted upon his party an Allegory, not devised by me, as he mistakes, but by a reverend Gentleman (now deceased) of his own belief, whose name for reverence sake I concealed; and whereas he had compared Independency in it to *Pharez*, and their way of Presbytery to *Zarah*: I retorted it and shewed that then the scarlet thred which the Midwife tyed upon *Zara's* hand, must represent some civil bloody sanction (scarlet being a bloody colour, *Isai.* 1.15,18. *Rev.* 17.4,6.) wherewith they would have their way and doctrine established; hence he infers, 'That I account them bloodthirsty men that think of setling Religi-'on by authority; an Inference as loose, as his charge of me with devising the Allegory was false; though I had rather use the word of serving and protecting Religion by authority, then attribute the settlement thereof to it. He may only thence infer, that I think they have a mind to settle their Contra-Remonstrant, or Presbyterian principles by persecution, then that I account all settlement of Religion by Authority such: Himself alledges a passage from another of my Books, where I commend Authority for securing Religion against blasphemy by civil Sanctions; therefore he might see I am not the man he represents me; Is a Negative Argument from my saying nothing of a thing in one place of more force then a positive expres-

sion

on of my judgement to the contrary in another place? But he ſuggeſts I was not the ſame man there. *Rep.* Yes, but the cauſe was not the ſame, I put a great difference between blaſphemies and differences in opinion; yea, between enacting againſt blaſphemies, and eſtabliſhing doctrines that rather border upon blaſphemies, as to impute mens ſins and deſtruction to Gods will and pleaſure.

Sect. 3. To pleaſure him a little with my thoughts about the Magiſtrates power in matters of Religion: I ſhall ſay briefly.

1. He may not exerciſe the authority of the Dragon ſpoken of in *Rev.* 13. 2.4. aſſume Names of Blaſphemy, ſet up and inforce Images or any other object, Author, or Medium of worſhip then God and Chriſt, and the *Mediums*, ways and Ordinances of his appointment; nor back with his authority thoſe that do, compelling men to worſhip them, ſwear to them, blaſpheme Gods Name, pollute Gods reſt, *&c.* Nor may he oppreſs, abuſe, perſecute and deſtroy his Subjects, or ſuffer them to be perſecuted, and deſtroyed, and eſpecially upon ſuch accounts.

2. He is *cuſtos utriuſque tabulæ*, keeper of both Tables, both as to his own practiſe and worſhip, as to the Author, Object, ultimate end, *medium* and way of it; he is to receive and do nothing, but as Gods commands approve, and ſo as to the manner of his worſhip in ſpirit and truth; his uſe and obſervation of religious Oaths, obſervation of Gods Sabbath or reſt, carriage to his Subjects, *&c.* and in reſpect of others. He hath power to ſee that Gods worſhip be preached, and practiſed purely and ſincerely, without Idolatry, ſuperſtition, or humane inventions, *mediums* and impoſitions; falſe oaths, or ſinful; breach of Sabbath, or additions of reſts, otherwiſe then Gods Word alloweth may he not ſuffer; nor his Subjects to oppreſs, defraud, or harm one another, eſpecially to oppreſs one anothers conſcience; no, though they be Biſhops; he may not ſuffer them to bind upon his people their inventions, and inflict penalties upon men, meerly for non-conformity to their wills, where they declare their conſciences diſ-ſatisfied; but he may pull down all falſe objects and *mediums* of Worſhip, impoſitions of Forms and Ceremonies that offend and trouble tender Conſciences, or Impoſitions of opinions, with penalties in ſuch things, where perſons may be of different apprehenſions, and yet all fearers of God; he may ſee that the Apoſtles practiſes in not impoſing in things indifferent; yea, decreeing againſt the practiſe of ſuch things as all could not practiſe without offence, as *Acts* 15. 28, 29. to be obſerved; he may ſend forth his Princes to teach the truth, as *Jehoſaphat* did with ſome Levites, yea, and preach it himſelf, as *David* and *Solomon* did, if thereto inted, *&c.*

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Exception 7. *About the Law.*

SEventhly, he excepts against *Answer* 167, 168, 170, 193, 196, 197, 290. from which he falsely collects as mine, "that the Law (Decalogue, or ten Commandments) "is of good use to bring us to Christ, but after we be "brought to him, his grace and spirit be sufficient to "direct us, so that we shall not much need the Law to "be a rule to us, at leastwise not regard it more then any piece of Scripture. *Reply.* Instead of picking dead flies out of my ointment, here he puts some in, for he hath badly,

1. Skipt over some *Answers*, that joyn'd with the rest, [illegible] gave my sense fullier.

2. Applied that to the Law of ten Commandments only, which I spake of the Law in general, as taking in Ceremonial, & Judicial also.

3. A Terts that as my saying or meaning that is not so; For though I beleeve the sufficiency of Gods grace and spirit, both for leading us to Christ, and teaching us in Christ, yet I neither said, nor meant, that the Spirit makes not use of the Law to both; nor that we shall not much need it to be a rule, or not more then any other piece of Scripture.

Sect. 2. To this his own figment, he tells us, "That in our Church "we have been taught hitherto, that the Decalogue is a rule directing, "and a law binding, even justified and regenerate Christians; and that "no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments called morall. Well, and he might have seen that in what I writ too, but that something hindred him. For I expressly said, that it is one use of the Law yet, to shew us what is sin, what not; and to convince us that we have, and do sin. Which, how can it be, if the Law binds us not yet, or be no rule to direct us. Or,

2. How should it (as I further said of it) shew us our need of Christ, and cause we have to prize him, if it bind us not to obedience, and so discover no sin in us? Or, 3. How can it shew us what to expect to be effected in us by Christ, if what it requires of us, we are not bound to? can we expect Christ should fulfill or effect in us, what is not due from us? His arguments then to prove that the Law was given by *Moses*, doth oblige justified persons to the duties therein injoyned, are all granted; only that must be somewhat qualified, with

respect to the fourth Commandment, else the Saturday Sabbath-men will be too hard for us: Nay, see the folly of this Reviser, he proves that point from my own words, even from those words that he gathers the contrary from. Was ever such a non-sensical thing found? He faults those Answers, as denying that which he proves out of them; how do they deny it, if they all prove it? and what a grosse, and wretched falshood is it, "That I plainly teach in *Quest.* 197. That "for justified persons to use the Law, as a rule of obedience, more then other places of Scripture, is to use it unlawfully. When as all my *Answer* implies, that it obliges to obedience, even such persons, and says it with all other Scripture (but not no more then other Scripture) is profitable to instruct, exhort, &c. Yea, he from that passage collects, that I grant all other Scripture to be a Rule, or Canon to us in beleif and life, but not the Decalogue; when I say expresly it, with all other Scripture, putting it in the first place; how can that be excluded, that is first mentioned?

Sect. 3. But here I challenge him of wrong and dishonesty, yea, of breach of the Law, while he is pleading for the Law, being our Rule. For he breaks the 9th Commandement over and over, as in saying, I held forth that instruction which I did not, and plainly taught what I do not so much as hint; yea, in quoting a passage out of my *Open Doors* Preface, he clearly abuses me, leaving out those words of my Sentence, without which, its another thing then what I said; For he quotes me as faulting some for talking of duties, to them that want principles to perform them rightly, and thence colls its from me, "That the Law must not be a rule of duties to persons unconverted; "so it must not be a rule at all to any person whatsoever. When as my words were thus, [talking of duties to them that want principles to perform them rightly, and not declaring to them that doctrine of Gods goodnesse that should by declaring Gods love to them rightly, principle them.] How clearly doth this speak the contrary, to what he draws from it? for when I say they want principles to perform them rightly, I clearly imply, they are to be performed; and that to the right performing them, the love of God that should principle them to their duty, ought to be declared.

Sect. 4. Again, p. 38. comparing part of my *Answ.* 197. with *Quest.* and *Ans.* 290. namely these words, The Law sheweth what we may expect to be effected in us by the grace of Christ; and in acting forth faith and love, we keep the Commandments, because in walking after the Spirit, the righteousnesse of the Law is fulfilled in us, *Rom.* 8. 4. He says,

says, 1. That place I mistake he believes, for I take it of sanctification, and no probably its meant of justification, comparing it with *vers.* 1, *Ans.* I take it both may be meant, both the righteousness that the Law promises to the doer of it, and the righteous affections, and frames it requireth. And by comparing the verses mentioned, the latter seems rather implyed. For *vers.* 1. speaks of justification as now attained, *There is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, that walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.* But the righteousness mentioned *vers.* 4. is spoken of as future to the same parties in compleat, however, for it saith, *That the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, that walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.* Besides, justification is rather upon the believer. *Rom* 3. 22. Sanctification in him. 2. He suggests, "whatever I teach, the Scholars may likely pick up here a seed "of Enthusiasm, why so? For if, says he, walking in the Spirit, and "Grace of Christ, bring a Superseadeas to the ten Commandments, "then why not to all the Scriptures? But where spake I of a Super-"seadeas to them, or where said I, as he suggests after, "That the Spi-"rit of God doth not direct us by the Word, but discharge it? Nay, "do I not expresly teach them, that the ten Commandments, with all other Scriptures, are useful to instruct, reprove, &c. Do I give a Superseadeas for their directing, and instructing them? Again, in *Ans.* 148. I teach them, that for believing and abiding in faith, God hath appointed certain means, in which his Spirit and Power is conversant for working and preserving it, to which he bids us attend, &c. Can that stand with a supposition, that men are to look for, or to a spirit waving the Word, and discharging themselves of it. Yea, I did expresly amongst those means speak to, and explicate the Law, and so spake to it in every precept, as that that now shews sin, and directs us to duty, in the *Answers* between 171. and 193. All which he skipping, and taking the *Questions* both before and after, makes this addition. Whereas he might have seen, had he been fit to be a Reviewer, that between those Question he hath put down together, I taught the children to minde what every Commandment forbids and requires, and that too of men as in Christ, as may be seen in the Answers. If men will do as the woman that shut her eyes, or was blinde, and then complained the house was dark, who can help it? That Answer to Q. 190. that he picks his accusation from, follows upon the direction, to follow the teaching of the grace of God, to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live righteously, soberly, & godlily; and I said that in walking so, a man observes the ten Commandments. Now is that all one as to say, he shall not need to observe them, or he hath a *Su-*

persedeas from them? If I say in making Latine, according to *Tully* or *Quintilians* stile, a man observes all the Rules of Grammar and Rhetorick, is it all one as to say that gives a *Supersedeas* to all Grammar and Rhetorick, and teaches them to have no use or need of them? whoever had to deal with an unhappier Reviser: And as injurious is he in speaking to *Rom.* 13. which I quoted in the Margin. Love is the fulfilling of the Law, from which he draws this as my conclusion, "That if we act forth love, we shall not much need to observe the Law, and will needs force it upon me;" that I take fulfilling the Law, for a making it out of date, and putting a final period to it. A thought that entred not into my heart; and I wonder how he could be so blind as possibly to think it did; when I expresly say, that in walking in love, a man observes the Law; doth he observe something out of date and made an end of? and then he tells of *actus eliciti & imperati* needlesly, and in some things falsly. For he says, I think that love fulfills the Law *per actus elicitos*. When as I neither said, nor thought it, but only quoted the Apostles word, *That be that walks in love, fulfills the Law.* Is walking in love all one with having love only in the heart? or doth the Apostle in saying, *He that loveth another, hath fulfilled the Law*, mean it only of a man kindly, and well-affected without acting it forth, I trow, by loving his neighbour, he means also manifesting, and exercising love also in all its streams, in act as he hath occasion.

Sect. 5. Again, in *page* 41. He says falsly of me, "That one chief "place, by occasion of which, and by following the sound of it, more "then the sense, I am misled, and mislead others, (heavy charges and "false witneslings against his Neighbour) is, that I quote to *Quest.* 167. "the Law being a School-master to tutor men to Christ. About "which he tells 3. or 4. broad untruths; As 1. That I amongst others, "mean by it the moral Law, either only, or chiefly, and not the "Ceremonial. That's the intimation of his charge, because giving in his dissent, he says it means the Ceremonial Law chiefly, if not only; If I mistake it, then I must mean by it either the moral Law only, or chiefly however. 2. "That I mistake the word School-"Master, as if it signified some great rigour, or some *Orbilius plagosus*; "to which he adds some pretty stories, of what manner of School-Masters some had, and what their office, of which we may say well, *Satis eloquentiæ, sapientiæ parum, abundè fabularum audivimus.*

"3. That I mistake the words (*we*) and (*ours*) as if it was

"of

ſe of particular Chriſtians, whereas it relates to ſeveral Ages. In all which he hath ſpoken of me without knowledg, or ground, and meerly ſlandered me; For I am, and have been for many years of his minde in all theſe things; Nor had he any ground in the leaſt from me, to conjecture any of thoſe Charges; for I clearly alledged it in my *Anſ.* to *Queſt.* 167. with reference to the Ceremonial Law chiefly, and its uſe. For to the *Queſt.* What is the Law? which I propounded of the Law in general, before mention of its diviſion into Moral, Ceremonial, and Judicial: my *Anſ.* was, The Doctrine given by *Moſes* for convincing of ſin, (that eſpecially reſpected the moral Law, though the other alſo in ſome ſenſe by the by, did ſo.) And for a School-Maſter to tutor men to Chriſt, (which eſpecially reſpected the Ceremonial Law. For the former, I quoted *Rom.* 3.20,21. For the other *Gal.* 3.19,23,24. as the Reader of it may ſee. I ſhall paſſe his miſtake, in ſaying I miſtake the word (Law.) Again, in my quotation of *Rom.* 3.21. in my 4th. lawfull uſe of the Law; we have had nothing from him here almoſt, but miſtakes of me, and breaches of the Law, and charity too, in all this ſeeming zealous conteſt for the Law. Now what hypocriſy is this to break the 9th. Commandment ſo egregiouſly, and ſometimes willingly, and yet to pretend great zeale for the Law, and its being our rule, as if he made it his rule in all things to walk by? might I not ſay to him with the Apoſtle, *Thou that makeſt thy boaſt of the Law, by breaking the Law, diſhonoureſt thou God?* thou that talkeſt of making the Law our rule, doſt thou make no conſcience to break that rule? for herein he hath both often ſlandered me, and takes away my good name, and reputation, and alſo drawes others into ſin with him, by harbouring evill thoughts of me, and miſreporting me, upon the credit of his Book; the Lord give him to ſee how he hath tranſgreſt both Law and Goſpel. Nothing leſſe then an open acknowledgment of his wronging me, and craving pardon for it, can make me ſatisfaction, ſhould I require it.

Sect. 6. Thus I have gone through that Exception. But I ſhall yet lay down ſome Poſitions, repreſenting my apprehenſions about the Law, with reference to thoſe things falſly charged upon me by him. As I ſay,

1. That the moral Law, or Precepts thereof, and righteouſneſs required in it, is of everlaſting force; Chriſt hath not abrogated

but established it; he hath not redeemed us from the keeping it, but to the keeping it rather; he hath redeemed us from the curse of it, not from its obligation to duty.

2. That Christ having redeemed us from its curse to its righteousnesse, hath not left us to be sanctyfied, and made righteous by it, but he is our sanctyfier, as well as our justyfier; and is to fulfill the Law in us, as well as for us. *Eph.*5.26,27.

3. That the way by which Christ fulfills the Law in us, is not by leading us to the Law, to seek to answer it, but by leading us to himself, upon whom the Spirit is to write it in us, and while we behold him, and walk after his Spirits Doctrine in the Gospel, and in the light and power put forth therein by him, he writes the Law in our hearts; the Law cannot write it self in us, nor we write it in our selves by observing it. The minding the Gospel, and Christ therein, is the way to be filled with love to God and men, in which two the Law is fulfilled, that is, written in the heart, and we apted to all the obedience of it. *Rom.*8.4. 2 *Cor.*3.18.

4. That the Holy Spirit leading us to Christ, and into the things of Christ, doth also make use of the Law of ten words, or moral Law, to oppose the flesh, and its workings in us, and to lead us to walk worthy of Christ, and so lead us to take heed to the Doctrine, and Instructions of the Law in our conversations and walkings: As to say, when the flesh prompts to neglect God, or prophane his Name; the Spirit, as it minds us of what God and Christ have done for us, and what ingagements are upon us to love and honour him, so to further us therein, it minds us, that it is his will, we should not take his Name in vaine. When the flesh prompts us to revenge, or hatred of our Brother, as the Spirit shews us grounds to the contrary in the Gospel, moving to love him; So it also minds us, that the will of God concerning us is, that we should love our Brother, or Neighbour, as our selves, nay, as Christ hath loved us. When the flesh moves us to uncleanneſſe, the Spirit minds us that God, who hath loved us, and bought us for himself, forbids us Adultery, and all Uncleanneſſe, &c. And to such purposes also we may make use of the Law, both toward our selves and others. *Jam.*2.8,9,10,11.

5. Yet the Spirit doth not only make use of the moral Law, or ten Commandements, so to reprove of, or direct us in our walkings,

ings, but alſo of all other Scriptures, as expreſſing the will or mind of God toward us; as for *womens being in ſubjection and keeping ſilence in the Church*, it leads to obſerve other expreſſions then the Moral Law, or ten Commandments hath; and ſo for maintaining the Preachers of the Goſpel, it makes uſe alſo of the Ceremonial Law, or things pertaining thereto, 1 *Cor.* 9. 9, 10, 13. and 14. 34. And therefore,

Sect. 7. 6. I ſaid not that the Law of the ten Commandments is the rule of our living or obedience, both for that I ſpake of the Laws as taken together, and the Ceremonial Laws, and ſome of the judicials concerned thoſe times, and that people, as to the practiſe of the particulars therein required; and becauſe had I ſpoken of the ten Commandments only, yet even they though very uſeful to command, direct, *&c.* yet are not the adequate and perfect rule of a Chriſtian life, nor ſufficient in and by themſelves to direct us in all things, though the Law (that is, the doctrine of God, for ſo Law ſignifies, *Pſal.* 19.7.) *be perfect, converting the ſoul*; and the moral Law is perfect in reſpect of blameleſneſſe, and in that it binds to all obedience, ſo as that *whoſoever ſinneth, tranſgreſſeth alſo the Law*, 1 *John* 3. 4. Yet it is not ſufficient by it ſelf, or ever was, to direct men in every action, nor did God ever ſo intend it; and this is clear in that,

Sect. 8. 1. God himſelf ever gave other directions and rules to walk by beſides it, though all of them bound by it; as Laws to build a Tabernacle to offer ſacrifice, to keep ſuch Feaſts, *&c.* in the times of the Law; and they were rules directing people in the worſhip of God, which had bin needleſs if the Moral Law had bin the only rule of their living; and ſo the Prophets and Apoſtles ſince have given rules and directions, beſides what the Moral Law of and by it ſelf injoyns, and therefore, *Fruſtra fit per plura, &c.*

2. No man in any age, ſhould he have ſlighted all but the Moral Law, for direction of his life, could ever have walked according to Gods minde, for it never told any man how many times in the year they ſhould appear before God, and where and with what Sacrifices; nor tells it us, that we are to worſhip God by Chriſt, and that Jeſus is the Chriſt, or what Ordinances we muſt worſhip God in, ſince Chriſts coming, and 600 things more.

3. The Apoſtle never propounds that Law, as that that Chriſtian men are to walk after as their rule and guide, in which they ſhould

have the righteousneſſe of it fulfilled in them, and be kept from fulfilling the luſts of the fleſh; but the Spirit of God, as *Rom.*8. 1, 4, 13, 14. *Gal.* 5, 16, 18. and the Law is not the Spirit, for the Law gives not life as the Spirit doth; nor doth the Spirit ſhew us onely the Law to direct us, but the word generally, and Chriſt ſpecially, to move and quicken to what the Word directeth to. ſo that the Word of God in general is the rule of all our obedience. thence that, *I have hid thy word in my heart, that I might not ſin againſt thee*; and *thy word is a light to my feet, and a lanthorn to my ſteps*, Pſal. 119. 11. 105. Thence I ſaid, the Law with the other Scriptures is of uſe to inſtruct, reprove, *&c.* which is all one in ſenſe with the Rule of obedience. Only I contented my ſelf with the Scripture-phraſe, and uſed not that of the Churches. Thus have I unfolded my ſelf concerning the Law.

CHAP. IX.

Exception 8. *Touching the Lords Supper.*

Sect. 1. Eighthly, he excepts againſt *Anſ.* 216. becauſe I ſaid, Chriſt appointed the Profeſſors of his Name, to take and break bread, and eat it, *&c.* which he alſo allows as to the word Profeſſors, but tells us, [‘it hath ſome ſuſpition ‘or umbrage, as ſeeming to authorize any ‘Chriſtian, though unordained, to adminiſter the Sacrament, and that ‘becauſe in delivering the Doctrine of the Sacraments, I ſay nothing ‘of any Miniſter.] But what expreſſion could I have uſed to have hindred a prejudiced minde from ſuſpition, which, I trow, is not in my Anſwer, but in his own minde, which I could not foreſee, or fortifie my ſelf againſt. Had I ſaid, he appointed the Miniſters of the Church to take and break bread, and eat it, I had ſaid what might have adminiſtred more cauſe of ſuſpition, that I am for private Maſſes, and againſt the Communion: Yea, I had ſpoken with leſſe proof from Scripture; for though I grant, that it pertains not to all to miniſter the Ordinances, nor can all be fit for it; yet that Chriſt in the inſti-

inſtituting of it, appointed or deſigned Miniſters only to do it, or makes any mention of them, I find not: he ſhou'd have done better to have ſhewed in what Chapter and Verſe Chriſt or his Apoſtles ſaid, Let none but ordained Miniſters adminiſter the Sacraments, then to have told us what a curſe the Councel of *Trent* (a Popiſh Antichriſtian Councel) ordained againſt others, beſides to whom they allow miniſtring of them, but of that not a word. I propounded in my Preface to lay down ſuch grounds as the Scripture warrant or expreſs, and therefore further then the Scriptures ſay, I went not, and ſo far I think I went. If he ſay Chriſt inſtituted it, and commanded the taking and breaking it only to the Apoſtles, who were ordained Miniſters: that will as well exclude all but ſuch ſ om eating it too, for he bid the ſame that eat, to do this, &c.

Sect. 2. The Apoſtle ſays in 1 *Cor.* 11.23. *That which I received of the Lord, delivered I to you.* He ſays, not to you the Miniſters only, but to the body of the Church, and why might not I ſpeak as the Apoſtle did. Might not Mr. *H.* as well ſay, *Paul* gave ſome ſuſpition and umbrage, as if he thought that any unordained Chriſtian might adminiſter the Sacraments, becauſe he mentions not there ordained Miniſters: Not any word in all his Epiſtles of the Miniſters adminiſtring it: So *Acts* 20.11. *the Diſciples came together to break bread.* What would this man have me limit Chriſts Ordinances in expreſſions more then the Scriptures, or then the Church of *England*, who in her Catechiſme doth not mention the Miniſters in treating of the Sacraments, no more doth Mr. *Nowel*, nor *Hemingius*, nor *Urſin*, &c. if they, though they ſo ſpake, yet for order and decency, they appointed ſom to adminiſter (whether ordained always or not ordained, the Scripture teacheth not, for whether that, or thoſe men that *Peter* commanded to baptize *Cornelius* and his houſhold, were ordained or not, no body can tel) might not I alſo be conceived ſo to think too, ſeeing I had before expreſly ſaid, that for outward order and helpfulneſſe, Chriſt had appointed in his Church Biſhops, or Elders and Deacons? ſo that he ſought *nodum in ſcirpo*, matter of accuſation when none was offered.

Diſcipulis ſuis, & in ſeti Eccleſia, ſays Calvin.

CHAP. X.

Except. 9. *About the Resurrection:*

Sect. 1. NInthly, he excepts against *Anſ.* 265. because I ſaid they that are Chriſts ſhall be raiſed at his coming, and the reſt afterward; in which (I confeſſe) I ſpake beſides the common ordinary road, but I truſt neither beſides the Scriptures nor the judgement of the ancient Orthodox: He ſays there is no ground for this *Anſwer* in any of the Text quoted. *Reply.* Yes, in 1 *Theſ.* 4.15,16. for the firſt part of it, and ſo I intended it; and for the latter part, 1 *Cor.*15.23. and *Rev.*20.6.12,13,14. But he ſayes, that of 1 *Cor.*15. ſpeaks not of the "Reſurrection of the unjuſt. *Reply.* Thats ſaid without proof. The Apoſtle treats of the Reſurrection of the dead, how ſay ſome the dead ſhall not be raiſed, *&c.* He ſays not the juſt dead, but the dead generally, though he bend his diſcourſe principally to the Reſurrection of the juſt, as intending it for the comfort of the Church, in ſhewing with what bodies they ſhall riſe; yet that when he ſays death ſhall be ſwallowed up, as the laſt enemy that ſhall be ſubdued, he means onely, the death of the juſt is too ſcanty, and falls ſhort, *Rev.*20.13,14. Death is not ſubdued, ſo long as it hinders the execution of vengeance upon the workers of iniquity: Let the *verſes* quoted by me be conſidered and compared with other Scriptures, and it will appear clearly to prove what I ſaid, for the Apoſtle having ſaid, every man ſhall riſe in his own order (and is, that onely the juſt are they every man?) He adds, firſt Chriſt who is already riſen, and become the firſt fruits, *&c.* Then in the ſecond order (they that are Chriſts at his coming, he ſays not then all men as Chriſts coming, as men commonly ſay: and why doth the Scripture never ſay ſo, but o'ey mention the juſt at his coming, if all ſhall ariſe at his coming good and bad? yes, and why ſays Chriſt, that he that doth good to ſuch as cannot requite him again, ſhall be rewarded at the Reſurrection of the juſt, *Luke* 14.14 if the juſt and unjuſt ſhall both

both riſe together? why ſpeaks he of that as a diſtinct period, and not in generall at the Reſurrection? but it follows ἔπειτα *deinceps*, we read it, then comes the end: but that (then) cannot relate to the the time of Chriſts coming, but to what follows, when he ſhall have delivered up the Kingdom to God even the Father; now plain it is, that he ſhall not deliver up the Kingdom then, when the juſt ſhall riſe, for they ſhall reign with him; wherefore alſo its ſaid, *He ſhall judge the quick and the dead at his coming, and in his Kingdom*, 2 Tim. 4.1. that implies, that he ſhall not deliver up the Kingdom at his coming; but when he hath reigned with his ſaints that here ſuffered with him, after ſome time of that, he ſhall deliver up the Kingdom to the Father, and then is the end. And thats a third period, namely of mens riſing, for of that the order is expreſly affirmed, and indeed the word ἔπειτα is an Adverb of order, and may be more ſuitably to the Apoſtles ſcope here tranſlated afterwards; ſtrange, that the Apoſtle ſhould ſay, every one in his own order, and yet find no order or time for the Reſurrection of the unjuſt: if there be its not mentioned with the juſt. But it is clear that he muſt reign with the juſt, and the juſt with him, *Rom* 8.17. 2 *Tim* 2 11, 12. till he have put down death; but if death was put down at his coming, where is his reign till that be put down? Doth not *Rev.* 20.13, 14. plainly tell us, that the putting down of death, and caſting it into the lake, is after the ſaints lived again, and have reigned a thouſand years with Chriſt? & if ſome of them reign before the other be raiſed, do not they then prevent them that ſleep contrary to 1 *Theſ.* 4, 15, 16. But he ſays, that in *Rev.* 20. ſpeaks not of the laſt Reſurrection: Very good, nor did I ſay ſo, if he mean it of *verſe* 6. otherwiſe that in *verſe* 13, 14. doth; or elſe he ſpeaks in that book no where of it: ſee Reader then how *ſua ſe jugulat gladio*, he overthrows himſelf; for in ſaying it ſpeaks not of the laſt Reſurrection, he implies, that there are more Reſurrections then one, and ſo he confirms my saying: that in *verſe* 6. ſpeaks of the Reſurrection of the juſt, for its thoſe that were beheaded for the teſtimony of Jeſus, and that had not worſhipped the beaſt, &c. and its a Reſurrection after they had been beheaded, and therefore not in this life time; now if that be not the laſt Reſurrection, then there is a Reſurrection, follows, in which the reſt ſhall ariſe, *verſe* 5. 12. is not this a pretty reviſer, that pretends to eſpy faults in me, and then when he ſhould diſco-

ver

ver them confirme them to be truth; but perhaps, he would have ſaid, its not meant of a reall and bodily Reſurrection. If ſo, beſide what is ſaid, the oppoſing them to the living of the reſt of the dead, after the thouſand years, and their Reſurrection being a bodily Reſurrection, ſhewed this to be ſo too, and what other Reſurrection ſhould they have after they were beheaded and ſlain? to ſay nothing, that *Juſtin Martyr*, one of the antientſt of the primitive Writers tells us, that in his times, ὅτι πάντες ἐν πᾶσι χριστιανοὶ ὀρθογνώμονες ἦσι, all that were in all things Orthodox Chriſtians ſo believed, in his Dialogue with *Tryphon* the *Jew*; ſo alſo *Tertullian*, lib. 3. *contra Marcionem*; and *Lactantius*, lib. 7. *de div. præmio*, the reader that hath the books may, if he pleaſe, conſult them. I ſtudy brevity.

CHAP. XI.

Except. 10. *About Gods helping fallen man.*

Sect. 1. Hitherto he hath aſſaulted the outworks, with what ſucceſſe, let the reader judge, now he falls upon the main forts, the cinque-points, as he calls them; let us ſee what he doth there, and truely at firſt daſh, he ſhews himſelf, *ſibi ſimilem*, the ſame man ſtill; for alas the ſame beam of prejudice and enmity is yet in his eye; for to my *Queſtion* and *Anſwer* 57. wherein to this *Queſtion*: Is there then no eſcape from this miſery? *Anſwer*, Yes, for the ſame God that creates us at the firſt, had love, power, and wiſdom enough to help us, and deviſed and provided help for us (now who but a man deſperately ſet to cavil, would fault this *Anſwer*? what part of it can he deny? or what part of it could have been left out?) He ſays, this "*Anſwer* is true, and without exception, ſave that there ſeemeth to "be a reaſoning from the power to the act, he hath done it becauſe "he can do it: Where is there any ſhew of ſuch a reaſoning? did I mention the act as following onely upon his power: ſurely no; but upon his power and love together, otherwiſe the act had not followed;

followed; yea, that he had both power and love; I rather argue from this, that he hath actually helped us. He ſays, 'He ſuſpects 'here a dark, but dangerous inſinuation, that God hath done for 'us all that he could do, and that man thinks fit he ſhould do, and 'this becauſe I have ſpoken darkly, he ſays may be beſt made out by my Companion, quoting Mr. *Goodwin* in his *Παρρησια*. Reply; I appeal to all ſober men what darkneſſe there is in my expreſſion, or what intimation, that God hath done all he can? no word, or ſyllable ſounding that way. Nor doth that ſaying of Mr. *Goodwins*, (though he was none of my Companions in any of my works or writings, nor I in his, nor am I reſponſible for any thing he ſays, he is old enough, and able enough to anſwer for himſelf) his ſaying doth not ſay any ſuch thing, I ſay. But he ſays, how dwells the love of man in God, if having means, and opportunity in his hand to relieve the whole World of mankind, without the leaſt inconvenience to himſelf, he yet ſhall ſuffer the far greater part of them to periſh, without intending relief to them? what ſays this of Gods having done all he could do, and that man thinks fit.

Sect. 2. And whereas he charges this principle with, "expoſing "men that walk by ſight, and not by faith, to *Epicurean Atheiſme*. I pray, how will any man ſecure ſuch from Atheiſme, who walk by ſight, and not by faith? It ſeems Mr. *Hacon* himſelf walks ſo, rather then by faith; for from his ſight, and conceit, he judges God not to do what he might conveniently for men, becauſe he ſees many evills, and miſeries continue upon them; but of any ſuch inſinuation, mine Anſwer gave none, no, not the leaſt occaſion. He might more colourably have charged it upon the Prophet *Iſaiah*, and ſo upon God himſelf, for ſaying, *What could have been done more in my Vineyard, that I have not done in it?* I ſuppoſe were Mr. *Hacon* made Judge, he would Anſwer, that either more might have been done, or elſe the *Epicurean Atheiſt* may well doubt of, or deny Gods being, or providence, or power, or wiſdome, or goodneſſe. Surely my Oppoſers Doctrine gives them cauſe to doubt of his goodneſſe, yea, and his power too, according to ſome of their ſayings, And to conclude, that God cannot help the moſt part of men; For they ſay, *He can have no new immanent act of will.* So then, that only which he hath willed can be do, except he can act without his will, and ſo he cannot ſave the moſt of men, not having willed to Dr. *Kendall.*

ſave them, ſeeing he cannot will anew; for the moſt men then according to thoſe principles of Mr. *Hacons* party; the Anſwer to this Queſtion [Is there then no eſcape from that miſery?] might have been No, for God had neither love, nor power, nor wiſedom enough to help them, nor hath provided any help for them; Not love enough, for he hated them, and would not have them ſaved, Nor power enough, for he cannot will anew concerning them, and he had ſo willed already, as to ty his hands, and power from helping them effectually; Nor can his wiſedom, however infinite, finde out a way to vary from what he hath peremptorily reſolved touching them; Yea, his will being himſelf, and his act of willing, himſelf, as they ſay, and ſo eternall, he could never have willed otherwiſe to have done, unleſſe he could have been otherwiſe, or unleſſe there was a date before eternity.

Sect. 3. See then Reader, if thoſe mens principles be not guilty of what he ſuſpects groundleſly in me, *viz.* That God doth for men all he can do, and ſo cannot ſave the moſt of them; and ſo if their Divinity, give not indeed cauſe for *Epicurean Atheiſme*, to live as they liſt, and take their deſtiny, ſaying as *Seneca*.

Sen. Herc. fur.
Fordum fata ſinunt vivite læti,
Et Thyeſt. rotat omne fatum.
Nec illa Deo vertiſſe licet,
Quæ nexa ſuis currunt cauſis:

While fate permits live cheerfully,
All things are wheeld by deſtiny, and
Nor may, or can God change thoſe things
Which run ty'de by their cauſes ſtrings.

Sure this is like an old Chip of the Manichees, or Stoicks fate, then any thing I ſaid, or Mr. *Goodwin* (in what he quotes) looks like *Marcion*. So that

In cautus in foſſam ipſe ſuam ruit. i.e.

He dig'd a Ditch for me
Into which fall'n is he.

Verily all my inſtructions given to ſeek the Lord, imploy that I think

think God can do more then he hath done. Though what he could have done more for our redemption, and for providing ſalvatſon for us, then to have given his only Son to death for us, and raiſe, and glority him, as he hath done, I ſuppoſe muſt poſe Mr. *Hacon*, and all men elſe, when the time comes that he ſpeaks of, when God will be cleared in his ſayings, and in his doings, and that ſhall be the appeal— Judge between me and my Vineyard, what more could have b:en done? &c. and that to little comfort to the cenſurers of his goodneſſe now, which we deſire, together with his power and wiſdome to adore. But I dudy brevity, the Preſſe is chargeable.

CHAP. XII.

Except. 11. *About Chriſts Death for all; and Gods giving Faith.*

Sect. 1. EXception the 11th. lies againſt Anſwers 93, 94. about Chriſts death for all men. To which he ſays, "The controverſy is not whither Chriſt "did dy for all, or not. That he grants, as judging diverſe Arguments and Scriptures for it unanſwerable. But he ſays, 'When it is ſaid Chriſt dyed for his Sheep, and for his Church, 'and that for whom God delivered up his Son, to them he gives all 'things. And when his death, and reſurrection, and interceſſion, 'do in a Chaine draw one another. And when it is certaine he doth 'not give all things to all men, as faith and repentance, we are of ne-'ceſſity put upon it to diſtinguiſh, *&c.* *Reply* 1. I was not controverting, much leſs with him, but inſtructing. 2. None of thoſe ſayings of Scripture mentioned by him oppoſe the other, that ſay Chriſt dyed for all. *Ariſtotle* or any *Logician* will tell us that Subordinates are not Oppoſites; particular affirmatives, and univerſal affirmatives agree well enough together. 3. We alſo diſtinguiſh of the ends of Chriſts death, as he might have ſeen in my open Door and others, had he ſought in charity, as much as in contention.

4. He misreads *Rom.*8.32. it is not simply, That God gives all things to them all, for whom he delivered up his Son. But applicatively to, and by the Beleivers, how shall he not with him also, freely give us all things? thinks he that he gave any one faith and repentance, in giving Christ to die for him? or when he delivered him up, were they delivered up with him to help to make the atonement for us? or is not Christ, and all things given in, and with him, to many that receive him not, and so have neither him, nor them? As *my Father giveth you the true bread, yet they received him not.* *John* 6.32. with 1.11 I suppose too upon a better Review, he will think that those the Apostle there speaks of, had faith and repentance before; and that the Apostle instructs them to wait, and hope for something, yea, for all things further needfull to be given with Christ to them. He that walks in Gods way may say, sure he that gave me life, will give me food and rayment too. And yet many that God hath given life to, walking out of Gods way, may perish for want of food and rayment.

5. Nor doth Christs death, resurrection, and intercession, drawing one another as in a chain, so much necessitate a distinction; For, for whom, during the day of Grace, makes he not intercession? what patience and forbearance to any barren Fig-tree, though but for a year and day in Gods Vineyard, but is procured by his intercession? *Luke* 13.7,8,9,10. and 23.34. As he is the Saviour of all men, but especially of those that beleive; so he makes intercession generally for all, (is the Mediatour of God and man) but especially for those that believe, asking for special things for them, which he doth not ask for the World. His *simile* of the General pardon to be sued out, is in respect of Persons of understanding (the *adulti*) true, but holds not in respect of all, as of Infants dying in infancy. But to pass over many things as truly granted, and some things against which Exception might be made, as not well expressed, I shall, to avoid voluminousness, (to which I perceive my Answer is in danger to grow) come to the καιρὸς or stress of the Exception, About Gods giving faith Touching which he further saith.

Sect. 2. 'Whereas faith is Gods gift, and he bestows his Spirit 'where he will, and man cannot believe of himself, nor performe the 'condition required, here beginneth the first overture of that secret 'difference that is betwixt man and man. And here first openeth it 'self the great mystery of Election; in that the Ransome, or satisfa-

'ction which God hath accepted as general, and sufficient for all men, 'That whosoever beleiveth should not perish, doth not actually and effe-'ctually profit all men to life eternal, because to all men is not given to 'beleive, and performe the condition. Here lyes his great Exception, Touching which I note,

1. That its true, that faith is Gods gift, and he bestows his Spirit where he will, ye these two are badly put together, as of the same import in Scripture, for he gives his Holy Spirit, says the Scripture, to those that obey him *Acts* 5.31. Poures it out to them that turne at his reproofs. *Prov.* 1.23. The giving his Spirit then is a thing consequent to faith in some degree at least, and is ill confounded with Gods giving faith, except we distinguish of his bestowing his Spirit, as to say, That it is either an accompanying the means afforded with the presence of his Spirit, by an inward working upon the heart, tending to turne, and bring it to God: or else a giving in his Spirit in the light and power of it, to dwell as a principle of grace in the heart; The latter only in Scripture is called, I conceive, the bestowing, or giving his Spirit, but I understand him to mean of the former. But then he greatly mistakes, in supposing that God who bestows his Spirit where he will, doth not send it forth, or afford its accompanying operations with the means to all, or to any but the elect. For he may read that Gods Spirit strove with the Old World. *Gen.* 6.3. judging, or reproving in them. That wisdome cries to all indefinitely within the Gates in the Church, and without in the Streets, and is reproving them, and stretching out her hand, or some degree of her power, to lead them to God. *Prov.* 1.20,21,22 23,24. with *Rom.* 2, 4,5. That in his Spirit, Christ preached to the spirits in Prison. 1. *Pet.* 3.19. Though disobedient under all Gods long-suffering. That the disobeyers always resisted the Holy Ghost. *Act.* 7.51. That therefore great wrath came upon men, because God sending his word in his Spirit, yet they refused, and hardened their hearts. *Zech.* 7.11, 12. That God is manifesting his truth in men so workingly, that men are fain to imprison, and keep it down, and shut their eyes against it lest they should see it, and be converted by it. *Rom.* 1.18,19,20, 21, 28, with *Mat.* 15.13,14,15. The light is come into the World, though men hate it. The knowledg of God is given to men generally, but most reject it, and say to God depart, &c. *John* 3.19, 20. with *Job* 21,14. and 22.17. Yea, Christ is always present with his

See *John* 14.17.

Nec ne-ter ullum est ut ad veritatis hujus perveniatur auditum, labor est potius aures obturare ne audias. Nimirum vox ipsa se offert: ipsa se ingerit nec pulsare inter cessat ad ostia singulorum. Adhuc nobis proximus est, adhuc loquitur, & nonnisi forte qui audiat, &c. Bern. de convers. ad Clericos. Cap. 2.

 servants

ſervants in their faithful miniſtration of the Goſpel to the end of the world, *Matth.*28. 20.

2. That man cannot beleeve of himſelf is true, nor perform (of himſelf) the condition required; but that he may not by the help of the Spirit afforded and accompanying his calls follows not, but the contrary is implyed in 2 *Cor.*6.1, 2. for the Apoſtle there exhorts, not to *receive the grace of God in vain*, upon this account that in *the day of ſalvation he is ſuccouring*; as implying, that through the ſuccour and help then afforded, it is made poſſible to receive Gods grace effectually; though not therefore made ſo neceſſary that it muſt be effectually received, and cannot be otherwiſe, for then no need of warning of receiving it in vain, if it be ſuppoſed they could not do ſo, while ſo helped. Indeed before ſuch a day of ſalvation is afforded, and after it is expired, the caſe is altered: *Iſrael* might have marched into *Canaan*, and taken it in poſſeſſion through the help of Gods preſence, while God was with them, notwithſtanding all their enemies; but when he had ſworn in his wrath againſt them, though they would have entred, they could not, *Numb.*14.9, 10.40,41,42.

3. In ſaying here beginneth the firſt overture of that ſecret difference that is between man and man, and the great myſtery of Election firſt openeth it ſelf, in that the ranſome or ſatisfaction which God hath accepted as general and ſufficient, for all men, doth not actually and effectually profit all men to eternall life. He 1. implyeth, without proof from Scripture, that there is a ſecret difference between man and man, before the grace of God in its receit make it, even by vertue of ſome previous perſonal Election, that he ſhould have proved, not only dictated; his premiſes prove it not, they being miſtakes as, is ſhewed: The Apoſtle ſays there is no difference, *Rom.* 3.23. and we *were by nature children of wrath, as well as others*, *Eph.*2. 3. Mr. *Hacon* implies, no, not ſo much. 2. He intimately contradicts himſelf, for how hath God accepted the ranſome as general and ſufficient for all men, and yet its inſufficient, in that God is not ſo well pleaſed with it for all, as to give them that without which they cannot eſcape wrath; that is Faith: How is that accepted as a ranſom for all, that doth not procure the liberty and freedom of all; or poſſibility for their being delivered: For if no man can beleeve of himſelf (as he ſays truly) and yet God affords not to all that they might beleeve, doth he not yet keep them in an utter impoſſi-

bility

bility of ſalvation, and neceſſity of periſhing? Why would he do ſo if his juſtice be ſatisfied, by the general ranſome for their former tranſgreſſion? had they not tranſgreſſed, he would not have denied them ſufficient grace for their pleaſing him; and if their tranſgreſſion be ſatisfied for, what reaſon can be aſſigned why, or proof given that God with-holdeth neceſſary grace from them? 3. He herein makes God and Chriſt to deal equivocally with men, tell them he hath ranſomed them, and done ſufficiently for them, and would have them ſaved, and yet the main thing is wanting, he did not purchaſe faith for them, without which he knows its impoſſible for them to be ſaved. 4. In adding that as the reaſon why the ranſom is not efficaciouſly profitable to all men to eternal life, becauſe to all men is not given to believe and perform the condition, he innovates from the Scripture which no where aſſigns that as the cauſe, but mens not receiving the grace of God, or receiving it in vain; their ſhutting their eyes againſt the light God gives them, and ſtopping their ears againſt his Word, which did they hear attentively their ſouls ſhould live, *Iſa.* 55. 2, 3, 4. *James* 1. 18, 19, 20, 21. Becauſe they refuſe to come when called, *Matth.* 22. 4, 5, 6. *Luke* 14. 23, 24. or come amiſſe, *Matth.* 22. 10, 11, 12, 13.

Sect. 3. As for Gods giving faith, I ſhall briefly lay down ſome conſiderations. As

1. That the faith requiſite & neceſſary to ſalvation in all ages, and perſons capable of actuall believing, is ſuch an hearty belief of the truth of God vouchſafed to them, through Jeſus Chriſt, as in which the heart is turned to him to fear him and work righteouſneſſe, *Act.* 10. 34. *Heb.* 11. 6.

2. That that faith may admit of great latitude, as to its apprehenſion of its object and degree of believing, and ſo ſome have believed more truth, others leſs. And ſome with the perception & belief of leſs have been ſaved, when others have been required to believe a great deal more, God requiring credit to what he reveales, and to no more then he reveales; again, ſome may believe with more certainty then others, but ſuch a faith as before-ſaid, be the latitude of it more or leſſe is accepted, *Heb.* 11. 6, 7. 31. with *verſe* 8. 13. 20, 21. *Luke* 12. 48. to this alſo may be applied that in 2 *Cor.* 8. 12.

3. God may be ſaid to give a thing two wayes, either. 1. when he gives ſuch means and requiſites to the having a thing, as that the

the thing it ſelf may, if men be diligent, be had; ſo God gave the people of *Iſrael*, on the ſixth day, *Manna* for two dayes, though through ſlothfulneſſe or contempt of God, ſome hath not for two dayes, *Exod.* 16.29. ſo God gives the ſluggard bread enough, that but opening his eyes from ſleep he might be ſatisfied, though through ſlothfulneſſe he comes to want, *Prov.* 20.13. or. 21. when in the uſe of the means afforded (or in ſome things otherwiſe) he actually giveth the injoyment of a thing, ſo Chriſt in peoples labouring for the meat that periſheth not, gives the injoyment of it, *John* 6.27. So God gives to the hearer and learner of him, actually to believe or come to Chriſt, *John* 6.45.65.

4. When God gives a thing in the former ſenſe, though men not receiving it, or uſing the means that they might have it, have it not, their not having it may not be imputed to Gods not giving it; the ſluggard cannot ſay God gave him not proviſion or meat, when he might have had it, would he have laboured for it; or the *Iſraelites* that gathered but for one day on the ſixth, could not ſay, God gave them not for the ſeventh too, though mens having alwaies preſuppoſe Gods giving, yet mens not having, doth not argue Gods not giving; nor is it well concluded then, that God gave not thoſe men faith, that have not faith, though moſt certain it is, that wherever men have it, there God firſt gave it; ſo it is well ſaid, it is given to you to believe or ſuffer, but it follows not that God either did not, or would not have given the ſame to others in the ſerious liſtening to him; in the means and ſpirits concomitancy therewith given; all that come are drawn, it follows not all that are drawn come. Yea

5. In the firſt ſenſe it may be ſaid, God gives faith to all of whom he requires it, and in ſo much as he imputes their not having it, to them as their ſin to condemnation, in as much as he gives to them the means and that concomitancy of the ſpirit therewith that are fitted to beget it. Its not the want of Gods teaching, but of mens hearing and learning when he teaches, and in teaching gives capacity to hear and learn; that is the reaſon of mens not coming to Chriſt in the evidences of him vouchſafed, *Joh.* 6.44,45. with *Iſa.* 48.16,17. in the ſecond ſenſe of giving, he gives it to all that hear and learn of him.

6. Where God in neither ſenſe, gives faith and repentance (as to children dying in infancy, idiots, and if there be any other elſe) to

them

them he imputeth it not that they believe not, nor will condemn them for that as their sin, he never punishes any for not bringing forth fruit, to whom he did nothing to render them capable of it, or for not bringing in increase, to whom he gave no talents at all, he observes that rule of righteousnesse— If I had not come and done amongst you and spoken to you such things as no man else, ye should not have had sin; he would not have charged it as their sin, that they heard him not and believed not in him, *John* 15.22-24. and then sure such must be saved by him that is the Saviour of all, especially of them that believe; for what should hinder them, seeing by Mr. *Hacons* concession Christ dyed for them, and sufficiently too. And sure, as it is usually said, God is just and will not require two payments, for the same debt, of Christ for them, and of them for themselves too; nay, that God imputeth not the not believing what is not declared, he grants himself too *p.* 38. *l* last. Its a truth declarable to all that Christ dyed for them; they that tell them so tell them but the truth, yet untill they hear it they do not sin in not believing it, how God may inwardly work on such to fit them for life is one of those things to which the Scripture he quotes p.60. *viz.* secret things belong to God appertains.

Sect. 4. His *similies* of the generall pardon, and of a dole distributed to all the poor of the town, the one upon condition of suing out the pardon, the other upon condition of attending orderly at such a time and place, are, by that conception of Gods not giving faith to many, rendred ridiculous; for who can say that King granted a pardon with a generall intention for all, who knowingly and wittingly suspended the benefits of it upon a condition impossible to the most, and took no sufficient course to remove its impossibility; or makes no exemption of those, from the penalty incurrable by the unpardoned to them to whom the condition is unpossible; the like may be said for the other, the difference between the impossibility of the Devils being saved, and the non-elects, is inconsiderable too, for there is between them both an impossible condition, what though not in both the same impossible condition, or the same manner of impossibility, both having an impossibility to hinder them, what Gospell is there truely of benefit as to salvation for the one more then the other? suppose Mr. *Hacon* and another were both to lose their lives, if they walked not a mile

in an house, and Mr. *Hacon* had both his legs, but ſo fettered that he could not go a ſtep, nor could he either unfetter himſelf, nor would any elſe do it for him, and the other man had never a leg to go on: what better caſe would Mr. *Hacon* be in, by having two legs then the other that hath none? the caſe is like: the Devils cannot be ſaved, unleſſe they can ſatisfie for their own ſins, nor the non-elect except they can work faith in themſelves, by his principles; and both impoſſible.

Sect. 5. He ſays, 'To thoſe that are choſen to life there is a ſpecial 'redemption, which as it proceeds from Election, *Eph.* 1. 4. ſo it conſiſts in actual forgiveneſſe of ſins, *verſ.* 7. *In whom we have redemption, the forgiveneſſe of ſins*; ſome redemption belongs to all, but not every kind of redemption. *Rep.* There is an actual redemption of the ſoul and ſpirit from the guilt and power of ſin; but that is not the portion of any in unbelief ſurely, ſo that makes nothing whatever it ſpring from for an unſufficient ranſome in Chriſts death for All, and a ſufficient, full ranſome for ſome, as conſidered in a ſtate ſhort of beleeving: Nor ſays the Apoſtle that proceeds from a perſonal Election of men as in themſelves, but that the elect actual beleevers have it.

Sect. 6. Again, he argues the unlike intention of the benefit of Chriſts paſſion, by the unlike application which may be granted, and yet he get nothing by it, for its clear he intended it to thoſe that beleeve, otherwiſe then to thoſe that beleeve not, and accordingly applies it, otherwiſe to thoſe then to theſe; yet he weakly proves it, for it is not alike applied to an elect Infant ſuppoſe, and to a beleever of grown years; follows it, that it was not as much intended to the one as to the other.

Sect. 7. He adds, 'That he that offered himſelf a ſacrifice for the 'ſins of all men, yet did pray for ſome onely, *John* 17. Weakly. For he could not but know that I gave a Solution to that common miſtaken Argument, in my *Open Door*, which it ſeems he hath ſeen, and its weakneſſe, in one that taxes another mans Doctrine, to bring an Argument againſt him, which he knows he hath anſwered, and yet take no notice of the Anſwer, nor ſhew its inſufficiency. I ſhewed that the end of Chriſts prayer then was the worlds good, to whom he ſent them, and amongſt whom he ſets his ſervants as lights in all ages, though the direct ſubjects of the things he then asked, was not the world,

world, nor any as and while of it; that is, in an unconverted ſtate; even as the end of our prayers for governors is the good of the Nation, though in our prayers for them, we exclude all from being the ſubjects of our petitions for them as ſuch, but themſelves.

Let him conſult my Anſwer to this further in my *Open Door*.

Sect. 8. He adds, 'That God who gave his Son, that whoſoever be-'leeves in him ſhould not periſh, did abſolutely intend that the be-'nefit of that promiſe, ſhould infallibly take place in ſome, by remo-'ving that infidelity that might have hindered them, and by giving 'faith which inabled them to performe the condition, for want of 'which others are loſt.] This may be granted him, and ſtand clear enough with what he Excepts againſt in my Catechiſme. For that God ſo removes the infidelity in many, that the promiſe doth infalibly take place, who doubts, or denies? or that he intended to do as he doth actually? Yea, what if he had ſaid, he intended to work in ſome, not only ſo as it ſhould infalibly, but in a manner neceſſarily take place, at leaſt ſo far as to make them actual Beleivers; (which is more then he ſays) that alſo may well ſtand with my Catechiſme in every part of its expreſſion. But as he propounds it, its little more then what I have ſhewed God doth to other men. For in the firſt way of giving mentioned, God did abſolutely intend, and accordingly doth remove the infidelity of men that may hinder them, and give faith or power to beleive, ſo far as they might performe the condition, though many do not what they might. He is taking the Yoke off their jaws, and laying meat before them; drawing them with the Cords of love, and Bands of a man, though they draw back, and eat not, *Hoſ.* 11. 3, 4. he is purging men that they might be purged, yet they are not purged, *Ezek.* 24. 13. He is cauſing them to cleave to him, as a girdle to a man, that they might be to him for a name and praiſe, yet they will not hear, *Jer.* 13. 11. He doth what may be done in his vineyard, yet ſuch as he ſo doth to, brings forth bad fruit, *Iſai.* 5. 3. yet what he doth of that nature is ſuch, as infallibly takes place in ſome, yea in all that hear and learn of him in a manner neceſſarily, ſo as they beleeve, or come to him, *Iſai.* 5. 4, 5. with *John* 6. 45.

Sect. 9. 'That is, in time and execution he dealeth not alike to 'all the fruit of Chriſts death, then we may ſafely gather, that the 'purpoſe and intention touching the fruit of Chriſts death was not 'alike to all men, and that we may ſafely behold Gods purpoſe and

' determination in what he doth in time bring to paſſe] may paſs for true in a ſober ſenſe, as I before explained it; but that this man that hath as great means as another beleeves, and the other beleeves not, proves, that God purpoſed abſolutely that that man ſhould beleeve, but the other he purpoſed ſhould not beleeve, follows not; it holds in Gods actings, not in all mens acts and motions; it follows that he purpoſed to enable that man to beleeve, and that he liſtning to him in that ability given ſhould beleeve, and that he would permit the other to fail, through his own default, of believing: and according to what I have ſaid, no ground for any man to murmure, but as he puts the buſineſſe, he is one of thoſe ~~falſe~~ Teachers that whiſper ſuch things as incourages to neglect the means of ſalvation; for though he grant more to the truth then many do (if not by authority of Gods ſayings, yet for the veneration of the Church which with ſome is more made uſe of, and leaned to, as the rule of their faith and worſhip, then the Word of God; for my part, I am more confident of the Fathers Name, and would rather have it writ in my forehead, then any preſent Churches, becauſe that may have its mixtures, and poſſibly may play the harlot, though I accuſe her not) yet the reſult of all he grants leaves a man at length in this condition, that there being ſome that ſhall ſo certainly and inavoidably be brought to beleeve, as its not poſſible for them to miſcarry, but to the reſt God gives no faith: therefore he may think with himſelf, either I am of the one, or of the other; if of the former, I muſt be brought in, take what courſe I will; and if of the other I ſhall periſh, take the beſt courſe I can: And therefore I had as good take the preſent good things while I may have them and live as I liſt, ſeeing my ſo doing if I be of the one number, ſhall not make me fail, nay, Gods grace will ſhine more fully by occaſion of my more ſins; and if I be of the other number, I muſt periſh, though I deprive my ſelf of them. I would we did more believe the doctrine revealed, and avoid the intermedling with ſecrets, which keeps men from beleeving: But come we to

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

Except. 12. *About the cauſe of mens periſhing.*

Sect. 1. THe twelfth Exception is to *Anſ.* 96,97. 98,99. In which I aſſerted the death of Chriſt, not properly and abſolutely the ranſome for ſins againſt the light and grace extended by Chriſt, and through his mediation, ſo as to render the forgiveneſſe of them due debt; but onely for the ſin of *Adam*, and the ſin that it brought upon us, conſidered as before and without Chriſts coming, &c. from whence he draws this concluſion as mine, "that "all ſin and ſins whatſoever, originall and actuall, of all men what-"ſoever, whether they repent of thoſe ſins or not do, obtain at "Gods hands forgiveneſſe as due debt, by means and vertue of "Chriſts ſatisfaction, thoſe ſins excepted which are againſt the "Goſpell and Chriſts coming a light into the world: yet theſe "may be forgiven too, if they repent, becauſe Chriſts gift for juſti-"fication ſuperaboundeth for the forgiveneſſe of more ſins then "*Adams* tranſgreſſion brought upon us. *Reply.* He might, and doubtleſſe would (had he then with theſe parts and wit lived) have drawn the ſame from Chriſts own words to the *Jews*; that if he had not come and ſpoken to them they had not had ſin, but now no cloak for their ſin, and again; if I had not done among them the works that no other man did they had not had ſin (that is, charged upon them doubtleſſe,) and my *Anſwers* ſtanding no more open and obnoxious to his concluſion then our Saviours, I hope they will come off the better from the charge of falſhood. He might have pleaſed to have given it forth thus rather, *viz.* That Chriſt ſo dyed for all men, that no man ſhall periſh but he that ſins impenitently againſt the grace or light brought in by Chriſt, and this I argue from their own principles that ſay, for whom Chriſt dyed for them it is unjuſt with God to demand any ſatisfaction beſides for their ſins, but to forgive them. Its unjuſt to require two payments for one debt, therefore for thoſe ſins for which Chriſt ab-

Iohn 15. 22. 24.

absolutely paid, God will require say I, no other satisfaction to his justice, but then to avoid the inconvenience of that other consequence of theirs and shew its falshood, *viz.* That (then every man must be saved) we distinguish of sins as they are necessarily and naturally in and upon men from *Adam*, and for these we say, Christ only hath paid the price, absolutely so, as not for them they should be bound to perish, but pardon is due for them; I said not to be given over to them, but to be in Christs hand for them, nor that there is no need they should be cleansed from them, now whereas Christ in order to the cleansing men from them, affords his grace and truth to lead them to repentance; men are found sinning against that too, and those we distinguish from the former, and say, that for these a discharge, is not so properly and absolutely obtained, as from the former: because by these they had not contracted any bondage, to be redeemed from, as Christ was considered to undertake to dye for fallen man, for these are consequent to that his undertaking & against the grace extended by it, as a man that redeems another man from prison, by paying his debts cannot be thereby conceived to free him from it, for debts after such ransoming him and again it to be contracted, yet for these also there is forgivenesse through the superabundancy of Christ satisfaction, which in repenting of them, Christ by his intercession obtains for and gives them, but for not repenting of them, and letting go also naturall corruptions as Christ is cleansing of them, many perish, *Ezek.* 24. 13. So that the debt Christ absolutely paid is not required again, but upon another score many perish.

Sect. 2. He confesseth himself " that he will not charge upon me "his fore-mentioned conclusion, but thinks I knew not what I writ. *Reply.* Yes, I know what I writ but he mistaking it, knows not what he oppose's, for he says, " The worst of *Pagans* it seems may " claim as due debt, the pardon of their most atrocious crimes, be- " cause these are sins that *Adams* sin brought upon them, *Ans.* 97. " and Christ found upon them, *Ans.* 99. His inference I deny the *Pagans* atrocious sins were sins against Christ, and the light and truth afforded through him, and so not sins that *Adams* sinning brought upon them, as considered before and without Christs coming, or that Christ found upon them in his undertaking for them, (leaving out which expressions of mine he deals not fairly here with

with me) this I prove from, *Rom.* 1.18, 19 *&c.* The *Gentiles* imprisoned the truth in unrighteousnesse, and when they knew God: glorified him not as God; but the truth and knowledge of God so as to give ground for thanksulnesse and glorifying of God, comes to no man now, but by means of Christ, without whose interposing, nothing but misery and wrath could have befallen us, all good being by *Adams* sin forfeited to us, and it was their sinning not as necessarily from the force of naturall corruption, but voluntarily and unnecessitatedly against the truth, striving in, and with them to reclaim them, that was their atrocious sinning charged upon them, both in that Scripture and *John* 3.19. and *Prov.* 1.24, 25, *&c.* to condemnation.

Sect. 3. He says, "Original sin produceth or bringeth upon us, all "actuall sins as the root produceth the fruit. *Reply.* That it apteth men to all sins is granted, but that it produceth them all, now since the light and truth of God by Christ is afforded to men, so as that by the force thereof meerly men run into their actual sin, without a new compliance with Sathan, against the truth striving in them, to reclaim them or keep them back, I deny. The same sin its true, may be produced by Originall corruption and the will of man voluntarily complying with Sathan to act it forth but sin is not say I, charged upon a man (by the Gospell according to the rule of which God will judge men) to condemnation, as it is the meer product of Original corruption, for, for men as so considered Christ dyed, and by his death paying for their sin, another payment by eternall death is not exacted. But as it is acted contrary to light and ingagement put upon us by Christ, and his mediation, to repent and turn to God, search and see in all the Scripture, where any man is held under wrath, and judged to destruction for sinning necessarily, so as he could not help it, except that necessity was contracted by himself hardening his own heart against God, till God leave him to himself and sin, but for his voluntary sinning against that, that leads to repentance; vain it is then "That the "greatest sins of all those by the Apostle enumerated, *Rom.* 1. sins "against the Law of nature, sins ripe to judgement, filled in mea- "sure and running over, *&c.* If they be but against the Law of na- "ture and not against the grace of Christ, claim pardon as due debt first, without asking pardon, secondly, without repentance

for

for they were all againſt the light of Chriſt, or goodneſſe and truth, as procured and diſpenſed by him, though afforded in the Book of creatures, and ſo by nature as oppoſed to verbal Scriptural inſtruction; and therefore alſo what was ſinned againſt led to repentance, *Rom.* 2. 4, 5. *This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men love darkneſs rather*, John 3. 19.

Sect. 4. He infers further; 'That then its better holding of the firſt '*Adam* as our head and root, then to hold of the ſecond, or to hear 'of him; for by the firſt, and the priviledges procured for him, we 'are clear of our old debts, and by means of the ſecond, we contract 'new. A ſtrange inference, and very irrational: For he that holds of the firſt, ſins againſt the ſecond, in rejecting his grace and truth that comes to call to the ſecond, and that I aſſert to be the cauſe of condemnation; nor will the not hearing of him help us, ſeeing many that hear not of him, as by name, yet have that from him, which for not hearing, they run themſelves into deſtruction, as thoſe with whom his Spirit ſtrove in the old world, *Gen.* 6. 3. 1 *Pet.* 3. 19. ſo alſo *Job* 21. 14. and 22. 17. Nay, ſure the more we hear of him, the greater means to draw us from our ſins unto him, that we may be filled with his conſolations and ſalvation. Again, how abſurd and falſe is it to ſay, that by the firſt *Adam*, and the priviledges obtained for him, we are clear of the old debt? For I pray what was there in my Anſwers, that implies that any part of our being cleared of our firſt debt, we are beholding to *Adam* for; that it ſhould in part be attributed to him, as by him; had he ſaid by the firſt *Adam* we were made debtors, and only by the ſecond we have this priviledge or mercy, that for that debt, as ſo conſidered, we ſhall not periſh, and therefore its better for us to hold of the ſecond, and be thankful to him, and live to him, then to follow the firſt yet, he had ſaid rationally and ſuitably to the Scriptures: Yet I ſay, and the Scripture will warrant my ſaying, and Mr. *Hacon* will confeſs it, that its much better for men to have died in their infancy, before they had any means or capacity for ſeeing the light of Chriſt, then afterwards to ſin and rebell to the death againſt it, and ſo die in their ſins; yea, or for men never to have had Chriſt by his Word, or works towards them come amongſt them, then for them afterwards to ſin (as before) againſt them: ſays not Chriſt himſelf ſo, *John* 15. 22. 24. and *Peter*, 2 *Pet.* 2. 20, 21. And as irrationally and falſly as he aſcribes to the firſt *Adam*

in

in part the being freed from our old debts, ſo as much or more irrationally doth he aſcribe to the ſecond, our contracting new; it is by our retaining our corruption againſt Chriſt, that we contract new debts, not by Chriſt that calls us from corruption, though men do by occation of Chriſts goodneſſe, make themſelves new debtors, as *John* 3. 19. and 15. 22,24. yet thats not to be attributed to Chriſts goodneſſe, but to their own wickedneſſe.

Sect. 5. What I meant by Chriſts mediation, and the light and the grace thereby extended is ſufficiently evident in what is ſaid above: nor did my phraſe of Chriſt coming a light into the world, imply the contrary: His ſecond quotation (which was the firſt in my Catechiſm) might have directed him without contradiction to think that I muſt neceſſarily mean ſo, as he ſays I could not mean. I meant it of his ſpiritual coming in his light and truth into the world, which in all ages was upon the account of his death undertaken, and in due time accompliſhed, ſo he went by his Spirit to the old world, *&c.*

Sect. 6. And whereas he adds, 'That there was no ſins before 'God did ſpeak his goodneſſe in the heavens and works of Creati-'on, or that can be conſidered, as without Chriſts mediation, ſuppoſed to be ſhewed in temporal bleſſings. I anſwer: There was a ſin, and that reaching over all men, and the root of all the natural corruption derived to us, before God ſpake forth his goodneſſe through Chriſts mediation for man, through his works and providences, and before Chriſt mediated for us ſinners, and that ſin derived from it, is forcible yet in men to [redacted] them to ſins of all kinds, and in that, and what it neceſſarily doth, and would have produced, we muſt have periſhed, had not Chriſt come; but that now, and what it neceſſarily produceth, and is not voluntarily againſt the relief that Chriſt brings us, is not charged upon us to deſtruction, but our refuſing that light and grace brought us. How irrational and falſe it is, 'that none but Chriſtians throughout the world, are capable 'of being caſt away and periſhing, any man with half an eye may ſee 'by what is ſaid, and therefore it needs no further confutation.

Sect. 7. The Scriptures quoted, *Rom.* 5. 18. 1 *Cor.* 15. 21. he ſays, I have alledged for the *Pelagian crambe* of the univerſal particle *All*,] why he who *page* 56. ſo took it himſelf, and did not pleaſe to diſtinguiſh thereof, but rather deviſed a diſtinction in the word

Muſculus ſays, non ſu-ſtamreſt, ut Redemptio propter filij perditionis gloriam ac titulum uni verſalis Redemptionis mittat, cum ſit parata cunctis. In Loc. Com. de Redem. gene-ralium.

For, where the Apoſtle made none, ſhould now rail upon my urging the univerſal particle *all*, and call it the *Pelagian crambe* (though *Auſtin* and *Proſper* alſo, took it in this point univerſally as well as *Pelagius*,) as if he had repented him of his taking it ſo univerſally before, unleſſe he ſee that it drives him upon inextricable ſtraits, that he muſt either be inconſtant to himſelf, or elſe grant the truth of what I ſaid, rather then which, he will eat his own Conceſſions; I cannot tell; but ſurely by giving it ſuch a nick-name here he implies, That he was not far from the *Pelagian* diſeaſe himſelf, when he conſtrued it ſo before. His thoughts about the latter Scripture, 1 *Cor.*15. we have partly ſpoke to before, *Except.*8. I may adde to *verſ.* 22. that it is not ſaid, as all in *Adam* die, ſo all in Chriſt ſhall be made alive, as oppoſing the *all* in the one, only to the *all* in the other, but as *in Adam all die*, that is, by means of his ſin, *ſo in Chriſt* (by vertue of Chriſt) *all ſhall be made alive*: 'That the Reſurrection of the juſt is 'properly a Reſurrection, and that the wicked ſhall not be raiſed by 'the efficacy of Chriſt the Saviour, but by the ſentence of God the judge, are ſaid in vain: The Apoſtle calls the Reſurrection of the unjuſt, a Reſurrrection too, and includes that uſually in the Reſurrection of the dead, *Acts* 23. 6. with 24. 15. and that they alſo ſhall be raiſed by the efficacy of Chriſt the Saviour, though not to be ſaved from the wrath to come, yet to be judged by him that was their Saviour, and whoſe ſalvation was neglected by them, is clearly aſſerted by Chriſt himſelf, *John* 5. 28,29. *All that are in their graves ſhall hear the voice of the Son of God, and ſhall come forth*, &c. and by the Apoſtle that ſays, *ſince by man came death, by man alſo the reſurrection of the dead*: He makes no diſtinction there of dead Saints from others, as if the reſurrection of them came by Chriſt, and not the reſurrection of the reſt.

Cui competit definitio ei & ſi ſimilium ſed juxta Paræum & alios competit definitio reſurrectionis (de quâ in Symbolo Apoſtolico tractatur) Reſurrectioni impiorum, ergo & Reſurrectio ei competit, vindicatur. Paræus in Urſinum ad Art. de Reſur.

Sect. 8. To *Rom.*5.18. he implies, that *all men* there ſignifies not *all*, but *ſome*, which as it agrees not with the Apoſtles ſcope, which is to ſhew that the extent of the good by Chriſt is as large as the evil by *Adam*; ſo it is the more vain in him, that before had granted that *Chriſt died for all*: And whereas he ſays it is limited in *verſ.* 17. to them that receive the abundance of grace, as the other in 1 *Cor.*15.23. to thoſe that are Chriſts, *verſ.* 23. I ſee no ſuch matter: What the Apoſtle ſpeaks of *verſ* 17. of *Rom.*5. is of another buſineſs then that in *verſe* 18. for that is of the receivers of grace reigning in life, but

the 18th of the benefit cõming to all men, for ſo εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους properly ſignifyes; to or for the juſtification of life, the benefit may come to more then the receivers of it, to the reigning in life; and ſo its implyed there plainly; for its made to anſwer to the *all men* unto whom the *offence was to condemnation*: But that had been an incongruity and defect to have ſaid, the one was to all men, and the other not to all men; to ſay nothing that Interpreters ſay, and the ſcope and frame of the Apoſtles writing ſhews it to be true, that the compariſon was begun *verſ.* 12. but interrupted by Explications and Obſervations, of ſome diſſimilitudes, (in which grace ever had the better) till this 18th *verſ.* and there, and not till then it is made up; but ſure that that came in as it were a Parentheſis, may not limit what is afterward aſſerted, as anſwering to *verſe* 12. To the other in 1 *Cor.* 15. we have ſhewed his miſtake before, that there is no limitation of it to thoſe that are Chriſts, but its extended *verſe* 24. to the reſt.

Sect. 9. 'He ſays, he can find no ground for the difference of 'ſins againſt the Law of nature, and the light of the Goſpel, that 'Chriſts death ſhould be properly for the pardon of the one, and 'not of the other.

Anſw. I made not my diſtinction in ſuch termes; as I made it, I found ground for it; indeed 1 *Tim.* 1.16. and 1 *John* 1.7. ſay that Chriſt came to ſave from both, and that beleevers, (for of them only *John* ſpeaks) have cleanſing by his blood from both, and that for the forgiveneſſe of ſuch ſins Chriſts death is properly effectual, I ſaid too, plainly enough, if any doubt it, let him read, *Anſ.* 98,99, 100, 104. His diſtinction of them that never heard of Chriſt, from them that crucified Chriſt, what is ſaid before, evidences to be beſide my meaning.

Sect. 10. "That I talk much and unſeaſonably enough of Chriſts death, for all is ſpoken rather inuidiouſly then fairly, for what unſeaſonableneſs in my ſpeaking of its extent, when I was about the Article of it, or about the Goſpel to be preached? and when can it be more ſeaſonable to ſpeak of it, then when men make it a character of Orthodoxiſme to ſpeak againſt it, ſeeing the Apoſtle lays ſuch weight upon it, 2 *Cor.* 5. 14, 15. But he ſays, "who ever made ſo "odious a reſtraint of it as I have made here; as if it were not pro- "perly and abſolutely a ranſome for any perſon this day in *Eng-*

"*land*, or in all Christendom, for all the sins of Christians must need-
"be against the light of the Gospel, their sins cannot be considered
before and without Christs coming, *Anſ.* He alters my words in
saying before and without Christs coming, whereas I said, consi-
dered as before, or without Christs coming. can he not so abstract
as to consider them, as in the root, and according to what they had
onely by vertue of that from what they are as against grace vouch-
safed? that I implyed that Christs death is not properly or abso-
lutely a ransome for any in *England*, upon such a ground, is falsely
said, sure there are many infants in *England*, that never sinned against
the light and grace of Christ, and many actuall believers who
perform through grace the condition upon which they by it should
be ransomed and discharged, from the bond of their sins, even
against grace too; and what was conditionall to them before in it
self, is become absolute to them, the condition being performed: but I
suppose I shall not need to go far to find those that limit & restrain
it a great deal more then I do, yea, from all the world, as to its being
a proper and absolute ransome for any one. Mr. *Hacon* is one that
doth it, *p.*56. when he says, "Christ dyed for all so sufficiently, as
"that there is a sufficiency with promise and proffer of benefit for
"all, yet not without a condition to be performed; now that that
is not a ransome for any without a condition to be performed (as
it is not, if not of benefit, without condition) is not absolutely a
ransome for any; yea and again, *p.* 68. "from all kinde
"of actuall sins properly and intentionally, though not absolute-
"ly without repentance Christs of-spring or children are dis-
charged, then it seems not properly and absolutely both, but he
should besides not onely have said, but shewed, how that properly
can be called the ransome, for a thing that did not then imbondage
when it was given, nor could have been to imbondage, had it not
been given as sin against Christ, as ransoming, or the effects of his
death, could not have been nor have imbondaged, or made as lyable
to punishment had he not been given as a ransom for us; surely,
the giving himself a ransome for us, respected properly what had
imbondaged us, and needed redemption, as considered before his
dying for us; before it I say, not in time simply, but in nature, as
the occasion of his dying; though for freeing us from sins against
his grace therein, also he there through obtained power as I have
shewed.

Sect. 21. For the proof of that Distinction I quoted *Rom.* 5. 16. that *the judgement was of one offence to condemnation, but the gift of many offences to justification.* Against that he excepts, that "infidelity and "sinning against the light of the Gospel, and refusing to be saved, "were found upon us by means of *Adams* sin. That I deny, as it is considerable as before Christs mediation: for how could that have made us reject salvation or light, if there had been none procured or afforded? nor do they condemn as the necessary fruit of *Adams* sin, nor are they such, but as they are our voluntary & unnecessitated sins against the mercy afforded to help us to do better. He says again, "the meaning of the Apostles words there is, "that *Adams* sin was "one; but Christ takes not onely that one away, but the multi- "tude of actuall sins committed by us. Well, but what means he by the multitude of sins? onely what that one offence necessarily would have produced, had not Christ come, and doth produce (notwithstanding he hath come) inavoidably in us, as it did in *Paul*, and in those that walk after the spirit, who yet were and are against their wills led captive, or that it produces in persons before any light or goodnesse through Christ is leading them to repentance, and not also those things in which men voluntarily against light, and unnecessitatedly sin? if the former onely, then I ask, is there any forgivenesse of the latter or not? if he say, not; the Scriptures shew the contrary, as in *Isa.* 55.7. *Let the wicked forsake his ways*, and God will multiply to pardon. rejecters of, and sinners against the light, are properly the wicked men; if the latter too, then how are they forgiven but by the vertue of Christs death? and so I have what I brought the proof for, as to that distinction: yea, and I look upon that one sin of *Adam*, though manifold, as against many Obligations and commandements, and as to its necessary effects and products in yet as one in its roote, turning us all from God, and polluting all our natures, and as the cause of that condemnation that came upon all, so I conceive the Apostle speaks of it; and that by the many offences opposed to it, he means not onely or properly its branches, but also many personall sins against the light and grace extended by Christ, which are many, in respect not only of their acts, but also of their rootes, the several willing compliances with Sathans temptations, when they might, through grace, have been avoided. The Apostle in that Chapter *verse* 14. implies a distinction of sins answerable to what I made, when he says, death

came upon them alſo that ſinned not after the ſimilitude of *Adams* tranſgreſſion, which implies, that there are ſins after the ſimilitude of his trauſgreſſion, and ſins that are not ſo; ſins not after that ſimilitnde, are ſuch as are not againſt light, knowledge, ingagement, or with free unneceſſitated conſent, for *Adam* had a known ingagement to obedience upon him, knowledge in his minde and liberty in his will, & needed not to have ſinned though tempted, yet did; but ſuch ſins as in which men having a new ingagement upon them (as without Chriſts death for them they could not have had) and having ſome light in their minds, ſome knowledge of God, and his goodneſſe and their duty, and ſome liberty brought into their wills through the preventing operations of God, Yet do voluntarily ſin, theſe are after the likeneſſe of *Adams* tranſgreſſion, ſins againſt Chriſt and the procurements of his mediation, ſuch as *Rom.* 1.18,19,20,21.28. *Prov.* 1.20,21,22,23,24,25. *Pſal.* 81.10,11,12.14. *John* 3.19,20. the like diſtinction is implyed in *Hoſ.* 6,7. *Prov.* 1.22. but I paſſe one to

---

CHAP. XIV.

Except. 13. *About Election.*

His quarrel againſt my definition of Election, *viz.* that it is a gracious act of Gods free will, wherein he before the foundations of the world choſe (or perpoſed to chuſe) the man Jeſus Chriſt into Unity with the eternall word, and ſo to be his holy one, the treaſury of all his bleſſing and worker out of all his pleaſure: and in him all the ſeed ſpringing out of the travaile of his ſoul to holineſſe and bleſſing with him for the praiſe of his own grace, in which I took In both head and members as the ſubject of Election, concerning this he firſt ſays, that "the *Queſtion* was propounded about Election," and the main "of the *Anſwer* is returned about the incarnation of the Son of "God, or uniting the man Jeſus with the eternall word, and then

" brands

'brands it as a bold *innovasion confusion* and *elusion*. *Reply*. He might 'as well charge the Apostle that speaking of Election he talkes of holinesse, because he says he chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we might be holy; is it not usefull to put into definitions, the finall cause as well as the efficient. And did I any more, in mentioning the Union of the man in Christ, with the word, and what followed concerning him? As for the putting the Election of Christ in with the rest, the Apostles tells us the Election was made in Christ, and therefore surely it took in both head & members too, if we were chosen in Christ, then not without Christ, and if not without Christ, then Christ was eyed & included in the choise too, yea Christ as the maine and prime, holy and blameless one, and others but in him. *Peter* also speaks of Christ as the elected stone, to whom others being brought and growing up into him, are called the elect, and chosen generation; I am not sollicitous of other mens concurrence in expressions, for I wonder how many that define any thing in matters of religion, do use just the same expressions in all things, might he not as well upon that score have faulted all my other *Answer*, as not having just the same expressions with any other man? yea and Mr. *Perkins*, and other mens, as not jumping just in expression with some Catechists before them? if I can justifie my definition to be true, let him fault it if he will, for its being new, what he mainly faults in it *Zanchi* also (as also the Apostles) justifies as we shall see by and by; that I am guilty of confusion "in making all one, things of a quite dif-"ferent nature, and of illusion or mockery, as holding out one thing, and giving another, are vain, and groundlesse charges, for I both distinguished the things, he says 'I confound as Election from incarnation, and gave the same I held forth, that is, Election with its whole Object Christ, and his Members, with their distinct ends. He having the preeminence in all things, had it, and is worthy to have it in Election too; being chosen to some things we be not capable of, that we might be chosen in other things in and with him. He quarrels with me, for saying the man Christ was chosen into unity "with the eternal word; whereas it was not the "man, but the manhood, the nature, not the person, as if I was therein guilty of *Nestorianisme*. *Reply*. But am I alone in so saying? or is that *Nestorianisme* in me, that is Orthodox in others? is not.

not the one nature often called by a word denoting the person? as a dead body of a man child or damsel, is called the man child or damsel, as in 1 *Kings* 17.21. *Luke* 8.54. sometime the body alone is called the man, sometime the soul alone. Yea, and says not *Irenæus lib.* 3. *cap.* 20. *Oportuerat Deus ut assumeret hominem, ut homo se daret Deo,* It behoved God to take the man into unity with himself, (speaking of the man Christ,) that man might yeeld up himself to God: And *Augustine* thus: *Tanta est unio Dei & hominis ut nec supplicio possit dirimi,* &c. such is the union of God and man (he says not of the Godhead and manhood only) that by no punishment it could be dissolved. And again, as I find him quoted in *Hemingius, in historia Jesu Christi. Quæ bona opera præcessere ut mereretur iste homo ut una fieret persona cum Deo*: That is, What good works forewent that that man should deserve to be made one person with God: Mind it, That man, was *Augustine*, therefore a Nestorian! no sure: Nor am I guilty, neither by Mr *Hacons* confession, having fortified my self against it, as he owns *Ans.* 68. I know Christ was not a person or man without or before his union with the Deity, it was properly the nature, not the person as pre-existent, or otherwise existent person then in that unity with the word that was taken into unity; and yet, as we may say, God called his Church, or beleevers to his Son, though not a Church or beleevers, but by vertue of his call: So may we say God chose the man Christ (him that is now in union with the Word, the man Christ Jesus) to be in that union, though not a man without that union with it. His charging me with meditating a mock Answer, and studying how to evade or elude Gods election of particular persons, are but eloquent slanders; my taking in the first elect or corner stone, it seems angred him: But let him chase himself a while; I hope he will be cooler ere we have done with him, though he quarrel almost with every thing: As,

Yea, and the dead body of Christ was called the Lord, *Mat.* 28. 6.

Dei verbo ad unitatē commixtus est homo. Aug. de Trin. l. 4. cap. 13. *Nec ipse ut tantâ unitate Deo ve.o conjunctus unacum illo persona, i.e. ipse homo assumptus mox ut homo etiam Deus filius Dei fieret ullis est præcedentibus meritis assecutus. Idem ibid. lib.* 13. *c.* 17, & *cap.* 18. *poterat Deus aliunde hominem suscipere,* &c.

Sect. 3. That I say chose or purposed to chuse, which he misdoubts, as tending to overthrow all precedaneous election. *Rep.* It is *Beza*'s one of his Masters, from him I received the notion, and gave both terms, chose or purposed to chuse, that I might not clash with him, where I think he may say true. See his Annotations on *Eph.* 1.4. and his Reason for it there, for I studie brevity, that there should be

ἐξελέξατο. *c. elegit repropositum æternum electionis est in Dei propositio de qua hic agitur substantivum respective tum demum dicimur eligi cum Deus suum propositum in nobis exequitur,* &c. Beza *in* Eph. 1. 4. *unde & de vetum de eligendis & reprobandis, & eligendorum decretum sæpe ob eo dicitur, ad* Rom. 8, & 9.

no

no election from eternity, I gave no juſt ground to judge me cautelous of, ſeeing I ſaid that God, from before the foundation of the world, choſe or purpoſed to chuſe, as judging either expreſſion ſafe enough; but he calls in a place from my *Open Door* Preface, that I find not any uncalled man in Scripture, called Elect. Well, can he ſhew me where ſuch a one is ſo called? I trow not: He ſays, 'there 'are elect from the beginning: But I trow they are beleevers, that are ſo ſpoken of, not any then uncalled: See the contrary, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 14. 'Elect (he ſays) before the foundation of the world. True, but that refers to the act of chuſing, not denominating any ſo as, & while uncalled: The Subject of it is, us the Saints, not any unconverted; 'That Election is placed before Vocation in *Rom.* 8. I find not in that term, and if the act of Election be before, yet that the ſubject of it was any, as conſidered in a ſtate before, is not there ſaid: That the 'elect ſignifies not choſen, but choice, I know not who ſays, but that 'choſen ſignifies ſometimes choice, if he conſult theſe places he can-'not deny, *Pſal.* 78. 31. *Ezek.* 23. 7. 1 *Sam.* 24. 2. That God chuſeth men when they beleeve is clearly proved in 1 *Pet.* 1. 2. where it is, *choſen in the ſanctification of the Spirit, and according to fore-knowledg*, but the ſanctification of the Spirit is in beleeving, but that when its 'ſaid, God choſe before the foundation of the world: We ſay, 'he did purpoſe to chuſe them, when they come to beleeve] is rather his *Beza's* then mine; mine it is not, for I added not, when they come to beleeve, nor gave that as the neceſſary ſenſe of the word, but as another ſenſe, that I think may ſtand: I allow both. He in purpoſe choſe before the foundations of the world, and he purpoſed to chuſe actually when he takes into fellowſhip with himſelf in their beleeving. And whereas he ſays, 'So they were juſtified, 'and glorified before the world was: I ſay, ſo the Apoſtle alſo may be conceived to ſpeak of them in *Rom.* 8. 30 *whom he called, them he juſtified, and whom he juſtified, them he glorified?* Was not that in purpoſe, or were they all glorified when that was written, Whom he had called and juſtified? He might rather have ſaid then, that no words, however warily uttered, can keep a wrangling mind from faulting them.

Sect. 4. 2. He faults me, 'for beginning with Chriſt in the Doctrine of Election, a great offence to them that lay him by therein, and give him not the preheminence in all things; could not he ſee that

to be the Apoſtles method, he choſe us in him; if in him, then not but with reſpect to him, as his choſen ones, ſeeing we receive from him and *his fulneſs, and grace for grace*: But whereas he talks of 'certain Verſes of mine, tendring that as a main principle; truly I know not of any ſuch, either of mine, or any bodies elſe, therefore I can ſay nothing to them; but if that be the worſt doctrine in them, I ſhall not condemn them. Hee ſays, p. 74. 'That Gods election of 'men, and his purpoſe to ſend Jeſus Chriſt, though both alike *ab æter-* '*no*, yet *naturâ*, the election of his Church (well ſaid, thats not of 'uncalled) goes before his purpoſe to ſend his Son; and aſſays to prove it from *John* 3.16. *God ſo loved the world, that he gave his Son.*

Rep. His proof is far wide from his Aſſertion, for his Aſſertion is of Gods election of his Church, and his proof is of his love to the world: Is the Church and the world all one with him? then it ſeems it might be read, God ſo loved his Church that he gave his Son, that whoſoever beleeves in him ſhould not periſh, *&c.* Whoſoever, of what? of the Church, or of the world? Did he in electing his Church provide for the world, that any of it by beleeving might be ſaved? Sure then more may be ſaved then the elect Church, or elſe his proviſion for the ſalvation of others was to no purpoſe: Or did he ſo elect his Church, that but whoſoever of it beleeve ſhould not periſh? then it ſeems all the elect are not out of danger of periſhing: When men miſtake and are humble, one would pitty them; but when men are confident, and undertake to be Reviewers, and carry it diſdainfully, and yet commit ſuch groſſe Soleciſmes, I think a man may laugh at them, and bleſſe God that takes them in their own craft, and puts them to confuſion by what they deride, that they may learn to be aſhamed. He ſays, 'Whether it be Gods love or mercy to 'mankind in general, or in ſpecial to the elect? And whether Elect-'on be of particular perſons, or beleevers in general, Gods love doth 'go before his purpoſe, or decree to ſend his Son, becauſe he ſent his Son out of his love to man. *Rep.* Who doubts all this? or what is this to his undertaking? 'That God elected his Church before he purpoſed to ſend his Son, did God elect the world? No ſure, not is all love, electing love, but that which renders the ſubject of it be-loved, and accepted of God, when it paſſes upon him ſo as he is there-by denominated elect: Whence (as I noted in my Eſſays) they are put the one for the other; but God ſays not of the world, that it is his

his beloved in Christ, for it is not in Christ his beloved one; though so loved (that is pittied) as to give Christ for it, as Mr. *Beza* owns my (or purposed to elect) so *Zaneby* (another of his own party) will condemn him here, for making Election before the purpose of sending Christ. He sayes expresly, when the Apostle "sayes, we were elected in Christ, he means we as members, in "Christ as in the head, he teaches therefore that Christ was first "elected and designed to the office of Mediator, that in him we "also might be elected, and being elected might by him obtain the "effects of our Election and be saved, and therefore we were elected "in the second place, but Christ in the first place; see then that I did not innovate nor elude as he charged me, for one of his own Authors went herein, even in the nature of this Election or description of it, before me, the learned reader may finde much more in him, to that purpose in *de prædestinatione sanctorum*, as, *nos, qui scilicet in Christo credimus*, &c. We, that is, that believe in Christ are blessed in Christ—in whom and for whom, being elected, we are to be saved, that God chose us to be his children unto eternall life, *per & propter Christum*, through and for the sake of Christ, &c. That Gods love preceeded the sending of Christ, then proves not, that Christ is not the ground or medium of mans Election, or first elect, unlesse that love to the world, could be proved to be his Election of the world; which I am sure the Scripture sayes not, nor doth he make a handsome separation of Gods love and Christ, when he opposes them thus, "Christ is not the foundation of Election "but Gods love is, sure those two will agree well enough without such a parting; God so loves Christ his elect or beloved, that he in him loves as his elect, whosoever is in Christ, or Gods love in Christ is the foundation of Election; and so Gods love and Christ, stands closer together then Mr. *Hacon* sets them. "That the Apostle calls the Election the foundation of God, is one of the elders traditions; I steer not my faith by, nor doth Mr. *Hacon* prove it, but onely takes it for granted, and what cannot I prove at such a rate? its but a private interpretation so to take it, seeing no other Scripture says it, but to say Christ is the foundation as laid in the Apostles doctrine, which is not shaken by any mans falling off; but hath this seal, that the Lord knows τὰς ὄντας αὐτοῦ, those that are his, is more agreeable to Scripture as 1 *Cor.*3.11. *Isa.*28.16. and to the Apostles scope in that place.

Eum indicat Apostolus cum ait, nos electos esse in Christo, nos scilicet ut membra in Christo ut in capite. Docet igitur Christum prius fuisse electum & ad officium mediatoris designatum ut in eo nos possemus porrò eligi, & electi per eundem electionis effectum consequi & servari, ac proinde nos secundo loco electos fuisse, Christum autem primo loco Zanch. *De nat. Dei. lib* 5. *cap.* 2. *quæst.* 4.

2 *Tim.*2.19.

Sect. 5. 3. He faults me for making Christ a subject of Election, though *Isaiah* and *Peter* did so before me, *Isa.*42.1. 2 *Pet.*1.4. And *Zanchy* after them, and many others; he is elected, sayes the Scriptures; not the subject of Election; sayes Mr. *Hacon*; what is it to be elect, but to be the subject of Election? did God chuse a headlesse body, or a body with a head thinks he? it with a head, then Christ must be it sure, not any *Pope* or mortall King, I trow, unlesse he chose it with as many heads as it hath had; and shall have *Popes* or Kings belonging to it, and then what a Monster would he make it? greater then the beast in the *Revelations*. Well, but those two Scriptures he thinks proves not my new doctrine, for so it seems to him that looks with a wrong eye on it; He thinks to throw it down with a distinction; telling us of a fourfold Election. 1. To office, as *David* to be King. 2. To be the visible "Church, as the "people of *Israel*. 3. To be the Church invisible or mystical, as "*John* 15.19. 4. To salvation and life eternal, *Ephes.*1.4. and then "tells us, that those places onely prove Christ to be chosen to of-"fice, as to give judgement, make Laws, to be a teacher and light of "the Gentiles, &c. That in *Peter* his office is spoken to, to whom "coming as to one in chief place, that in him we may be establish-"ed, a chief corner stone, that is, for the good of others, to hold "the building firm, &c. *Reply*. Not to examine the aptnesse of his proofs, how doth this disprove what I said? Christ was chosen to office for the good of others, therefore he was not chosen, as the head and prime of the elect, how follows that? or how agrees it with what he said, p.75. that Christ was given in *caput electorum*! was he given to be head of the elect, and yet none of the elect? or no partaker with the elect, or the elect with him, in what the Election of the whole body is to? thats strange. Its just as if he should say, God appointed the head to be above the body, and to have distinct and nobler offices then the other members have, as to be the seat of the senses, memory, understanding; therefore the body and it fell not under any common appointment; but was not Christ chosen to honour too, as well as office? and are not the Church also chosen to office as well as to life? they that rejected Christ, rejected him to dishonour; but God chose him to highest honour, as well as office, and are not the Church by his own confession, chosen to honour too in a prime notion! why then might they not both be

chosen

choſen together, they are to have together what they be choſen to; the glory thou gaveſt to me, I have given them, and Father I will that they be with me where I am, *John* 17. yea, and they are ordained to go the ſame way, and as it were together, through affliction to it, and why then not together in the Election? That the Church is choſen to office too, ſee 1 *Pet.*2.5.9. to be a ſpirituall houſe, an holy Prieſthood, to offer up ſpiritual ſacrifices acceptable to God through Jeſus Chriſt, are not thoſe offices as well as honours? again *verſe* 9. ye are a choſen generation, a royall Prieſthood, an holy Nation, that ye may ſhew forth the vertues of him that called you, &c. See here is office and honour too, as Chriſt hath office and honour too; yea, that very place proves fully againſt him, for is not Chriſt called the elect ſtone, to be the foundation and corner ſtone, and they the building? what? ſhall not the foundation, and the building fall under one Election? ſhall their different places in the building, divide them from being altogether choſen to be the holy building? when God choſe the Temple in *Jeruſalem*, 2 *Chron.*7.16. becauſe the foundation, and walls, and roof, had not the ſame office, were they not therefore the ſubject of Gods choiſe? again in *Epheſ.* 1.4. there is no mention of choiſe to ſalvation, but to be holy, and without blame before him in love, and to be bleſſed with all ſpirituall bleſſings, and are not all theſe things common with Chriſt, and his people, though differently? in him firſt as the Prime elect, and then as in him, yea, and was not Chriſt choſen to life and ſalvation as man? could any part of the ſeed of *David* or *Abraham* have eſcaped death, or been glorified in life, had it not been choſen of God thereto, and that by Chriſts dying? was not he ſaved in death and out of it? *Zech.*9.9. *Heb.*5.7. and that that dyed, and was ſaved, in and by death, is it not glorified in eternall life? ישע ſo that in Chriſt and his Church, all the ends of choiſe meet that he ſpeaks of, and what he omits, they were choſen to ſalvation, to honour, to office, to be the viſible Church, and inviſible too, to be holy and blameleſſe in love, to glory through ſufferings, and to inherit together the Kingdom and eternall life, ſo that inſtead of overthrowing my definition, he hath but daſht himſelf againſt a ſtone, and confirmed what I had written.

Sect. 6. 4. "He faults me for making Chriſt the onely elected "perſonally, becauſe I ſaid, and in him all the ſeed, ſpringing forth

"of the travaile of his ſoul, all in generall, not one in particular, "not one determinately. *Reply.* how follows that? if all in generall then every one in particular, and determinately as in him. I thought the generall had included the particulars, not excluded them, I am ſure inſtead of my having new doctrines, he hath new Logick; all in generall, therefore none in particular, the 2 *Tim.* 2. 18. as before, doth not ſay Election is the foundation, nay, rather it is of the foundation and building too, ſo St. *Peter* tells us, 2 *Pet.* 2. 4, 5. 9. nor is Gods knowing thoſe that are his, the foundation, but the ſeal of the foundation; the foundation hath this ſeal, the Lord knoweth them that are his, he ſaith not all the building hath the ſeal, but the foundation, as ſignifying God knows who are his, who are the foundations, Chriſts, and ſo Gods peculiarly as they are Chriſts, that is, Gods knowing, owning and approving them in particular is by vertue of the foundation Jeſus Chriſt, and ſo a confirmation of him and the doctrine laid as concerning him, that God knows, or approves, owns and takes care, of all that are in that doctrine, and ſo upon that foundation of his own, he knows both *quales* and *qui* too, he ſay not he knows who ſhall be his, and yet are not; in ſuch a ſenſe of knowing, as at preſent in their uncalled eſtate, and ſo while out of the foundation to own approve and juſtifie them: but the Lord knoweth them that are his τὰς ὄντας αὐτῶ. They that have not the ſpirit of Chriſt are none of his, *Rom.* 8, 9. they are not known, owned, and approved of him, but they that are his, he knows them all in general, and each one in particular, and by name, what makes this for him, or againſt any thing I ſaid? paſſe we then to the next exception,

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

Except. 14. *About Actual Election.*

ABout actuall Election (to *Anſ.* 140.) which I ſaid, is made in believing, he "grants it, true, "they may be ſaid to be elect then, but I ought "not to tearm it Election but vocation, that is, it is ſo, but I may not call it ſo, a pretty confutation; he ſays the Apoſtle calls it ſo *Rom.* 8.29,30. be it ſo there, that calling includes both yet in other places he diſtinguiſhes vocation from actual Election, and ſpeaks of Election as a farther thing, ſo 2 *Pet.*1 10. make your calling and Election βεβαιαν, firm; not evident as it might be of a ſecret Election as he takes it, but firm, ſtable, and this is ſaid to be in the ſanctification of the ſpirit, and belief of the truth, 2 *Theſ.*2 13. * *from the beginning*, there being from the beginning of the Goſpel preaching amongſt them, and Gods faſtening his love upon them, ſo as all are not; like as the ſame phraſe is uſed, 1 *John* 2.24. To the Scriptures I quoted, he gives moſt ſhameful put-offs, to 1 *Pet.*2.9. he ſays, its to the Church viſible, true but is it nothing more, are all the viſible Church, a peculiar people beloved of God? are the hypocrites in it ſo? *John* 15,16 he ſays is meant of a choice to Apoſtleſhip, *verſe* 19. he confeſſes ſpeaks of Election to the Church inviſible; if ſo, then I ſuppoſe *verſe* 16. took in the ſame too beſides Apoſtleſhip, and is not that to be taken out of the world into fellowſhip with God and Chriſt? but he ſays, "thats vocation, a ſorry ſhift, its included "ſometime in vocation, but is not ſo large; for many be the called, few the choſen; doth our Saviour call it Vocation, or Election there? is it not, I have choſen you out of the world, and may not a Chatechiſt give it the Name Chriſt give it, *ex quo venit invidia*! he ſays The Lord hath choſen him that is godly, is to be underſtood of choiſe to office, that is the Kingdom. *Pſal* 43. a piteous evaſion, the Text ſays he hath choſen or ſeparated to himſelf, and Mr. *Hacon* ſayes to the Kingdom, choſes he godly man alwaies to be Kings?

* *Vocationem efficacem nomine electionis intelligit; non tam de ipſâ re quàm de nobis ipſis eligimur cum Deus æternum ſuum decretum per vocationem exequitur* Bez. *in* 1 Pet. 1.2. *Deus ſuos, ſeparat à reliq ud turbâ & mirabiliter ſervat eos & tandem mirando modo eos liberat & oſtendit toti mundo eos ſibi curæ eſſe ad totum corpus Eccleſia reſtius accomodatum.* Hen. Mol. *in* Pſal 4.3.

Kings? that were brave indeed, ſo to *Pſal.*65.4. bleſſed is the man whom thou chuſeſt, is meant of chuſing or admitting to the Church viſible, then *Judas* and the *Phariſees* were bleſſed men; * he concludes it thus "that I obſcure what I undertook to open, whe-"ther out of Artifice, or too little Art, &c. But I may better conclude it, that he hath piteouſly cavill'd here, and made ſorry and ſenſleſſe evaſions, whether out of wilfulneſſe, or ſome hand of the Lord infatuating him, I know not; but me thinks both he himſelf, and all that read him, ſhould be aſhamed of it. I heard that a Doctor and ſome reverend men in *Cambridge*, gave approbation to this piece of his: I hope it is not ſo, for if it be, I greatly fear God hath infatuated the men of this generation, becauſe of their too long, and ſtubborn oppoſition of the truth, that they ſhould commend things ſo ſenſeleſſe.

* *Accepit ſibi ex genere humano Eccleſiam quam eligit (nota eligit in præſenti) vocat, juſtificat, & regenerat ad ſalutem æternam*, &c. *Idem in* Pſal.65.4.

CHAP. XVI.

Exception 15. *About perſonall Election.*

Sect. 1. NExtly, he excepts to what I ſaid in *Anſ.* 141. That God did not chuſe his elect to holineſſe and glory; in their own perſonal conſiderations, either as in *Adam*, ſtanding, or in him as fallen, but in Chriſt. To this he implies, that "they might be conſidered perſonally "and in themſelves, and either as ſtand-"ing or fallen, and yet in Chriſt too; but he only ſays it, without proof or reaſon to evince it. Its clear that the Apoſtle ſays, neither the one nor the other, but in Chriſt onely, *Epheſ.*1.4. that which the Apoſtle ſays, I aſſert, if any will aſſert the other, let them prove it, and I will receive it; Chriſt is certainly neither *Adam* ſtanding nor fallen, nor any mans perſonal condition; yea, were the choiſe of any as in any of thoſe conſiderations; it could not be in Chriſt, becauſe as ſuch, they are not in Chriſt, the word (as) determining the object to that ſpecifick formal conſideration, if we adde another conſideration in which the choiſe was, it deſtroys the other from being the formal conſideration of the choiſe; as he that gives another a cup

a cup of water as a Diſciple, doth not give it him ſimply, as to a thirſty man, but he left out the word (as) therefore in his repeating my words, and renders them onely, not in *Adam* ſtanding, or fallen, but in Chriſt, which was not honeſtly done; but he gathers from me further, that "they muſt be in Chriſt when they were "choſen, and ſo in Chriſt, muſt not go to (choſe) but to (us) *elegit nos exiſtentes in Chriſto*, and yet with the next breath, denies that again to be my meaning, and ſays, and unſays and ſo in one of his ſayings, he muſt needs ſay falſely of me, if not in both.

Sect. 2. He quotes a paſſage from the preface to my *open door*, to finde out my ſenſe by wherein I ſaid, That we were choſen to holineſſe, and bleſſing in Chriſt, as the preſent freemen of *Lin* might be ſaid to have been choſen by foregoing Kings, to ſuch priviledges as they now have in their firſt chuſing it to be a corporation, and in thoſe that were then made members of it, whence he gathers, that "I make but a faint matter of Election if any thing at all, "ſuch a King (ſayeth he) that above an hundred years ſince did chuſe "a corporation, neither did, nor doth chuſe them, who are ad- "mitted freemen ſince that time, no more then he did chuſe the "chief Magiſtrate this year, or their Burgeſſes that were ſent thence, "to the laſt *Parliament*. But this is quite beſides my ſayings, and the paſſage of the Apoſtle alluded to, for neither ſpeak I of chuſing to be freemen, but of chuſing thoſe that are freemen to the priviledges they have; nor ſpeak the Apoſtle of chuſing ſome to be in Chriſt, but of chuſing ſome in Chriſt, to the priviledges of holineſſe, and blameleſneſſe in love: and we may ſay ſuch freemen as are now ſo are choſen, and admitted now to ſuch priviledges, by vertue of that firſt choiſe of the corporation, and grant of ſuch priviledges, more directly, then the preſent chief Magiſtrate was choſen by ſuch a King, to be chief Magiſtrate; that this, or that man be made free, or that this man be chief Magiſtrate, was not appointed by the grant of ſuch a King; but that this, or that man being free, or this man being chief Magiſtrate, ſhould have ſuch priviledges, they have from thence.

Sect. 3. He ſays "there can be no Election, where there is no "knowledge of what is choſen, or refuſed, and therefore that ſi- militude can neither prove nor illuſtrate, being falſe in the ground of it. *Reply.* No ſimilitudes run of all four, nor is it needfull they

ſhould anſwer in every thing; its enough for illuſtration, that they agree in their maine intendment: and ſo this doth here, for the knowledge of the things choſen and refuſed, were in that King ſuppoſe, for they were the priviledges the freemen were choſen to, and them he knew, and choſe in his grant, though the perſons after to be choſen to them, he knew not; if we ſuppoſe he had been a Prophet indued with certain knowledge, of what perſons ſhould be ſucceſſively in every age made free, that had not altered the caſe; for ſtill the choiſe of, and to ſuch priviledges as freemen, was in his firſt ordination, or choiſe, ſo to priviledge the freemen of this corporation, and not in the knowledge of the perſons. Take another *ſimile* to illuſtrate it more clearly, God himſelf choſe the new-moon-day to be an holy day, now he knew what days they were that would be new moons, as to ſay, what day of each of our moneths, or of any week to the worlds end, yea, and alſo effects, and orders them to be ſuch, and ſuch days of the week, moneth, or year, yet may we ſay, that God choſe not ſuch and ſuch days of the week, as are new-moon-days ſimply conſidered in themſelves; as they are *Thurſday*, *Friday*, &c. The third, or ſixth day of *January*, *Februry*, or the like, to be holy dayes; but onely as they are new-moon-dayes, ſo as they may be ſaid to have been choſen for that time of the *Jewiſh* Common-Wealth, in the choiſe of the new-moon, and not in their particular conſiderations, as otherwiſe conſiderable, nor doth either Gods knowledge what days they will fall on, or ordering the new-moon on thoſe dayes, make ſuch dayes to be dayes of choiſe, to be holy (ſuppoſing no other dayes to be holy) upon any other conſideration, but as they were days of the new-moon.

Sect. 4. He ſayes, "this underſtanding of the myſtery of Elecți-"on becomes not me, who talk of cleaving to the word of God, "becauſe I might have read *verſe* 5. of predeſtination by Chriſt, "and *verſe* 7. that we have redemption in Chriſt. Well, what ſerves this to, unleſſe, 1. To ſhew that he runs into the ſame fault he cauſeleſely taxt me for, that is, confounds together things ſeparated, as Election, predeſtination, redemption, as if they were one: or elſe, 2. That he overthrows his own conceit of Gods electing ſome perſons to ſalvation, firſt, in order of nature; and then electing Chriſt to the office of Mediatorſhip for them, for

thas

that conceit will make the Election and predestination to be out of, and besides Christ, and so neither in, nor by him, because that decree should be a compleat decree of it self, that such persons should be saved in order of nature, before the decree of Christ as Mediator; now what is before another in order of nature is not in, or by that thing, in that consideration which it is before, so that instead of electing men in Christ, or predestinating them by Christ, here is an electing Christ, in electing men, or by occasion of it otherwise, no Election of him, for other Election of him, he says he knows none. I might note that the υἱοθεσία adoption of Sons spoken of, is rather to be joyned with (by Christ) then the act of predestination, for it is not having by him predestinated us to the adoption of Sons, but predestinated us to the adoption of Sons by him, though either way it may be true, and that adoption of Sons may be understood actively, or passively: Actively, as the ministerial work of the Apostles, to which they were chosen in Christ, not to bring men under servitude, as *Moses* formerly, but to bring to Sonship by their doctrine, and that seems very agreeable with the Apostls scope, in all the *verses* from 3. to 12. and the rather because he distinguishes the persons he speaks of, from *verse* 3. to 12. from those he after speaks to, and in *verse* 12. changes the phrase from *us* to *you*, distinguishing there between them: Passively, for the being made sons, both are by Christ, yea, Christ in diverse respects, is both the ground and Author of predestination and Election, so that the saying (by Christ) *verse* 5. crossed not the saying (in Christ) *verse* 4. or my understanding of it. As for redemption in Christ, he askes, "what had Christs redemption first, and then we in him? had he "forgiveneſſe of sins in him first, and then we? and says, no, but by "him, and his mediation, we are redeemed, have our sins forgiven, &c. In which he shews his ignorance again, instead of mine, for God hath given us eternal life, and this life is not onely by, but also in his Son; so as he that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life, if eternall life be in him, then redemption, remission, &c. else we are not compleat in him, but may be compleatly saved by him without him, or though we never come to be in him, but abide separated from him; but if what a man is to have by him, is also inseparably in him, then no having that thing, but by having him also, or being in him in whom it is; as if a feast be carried

See *Zanch. de praedest. Sanctorum.*

John 5. 11, 12.

ried out of the houſe to the bidden gueſts, then no need for them to come into the houſe to have it, as no need to come into the houſe to be bidden to the houſe, but if it be onely in the houſe then no partaking of it, but by coming into the houſe wherein it is. Doth this gentleman know Chriſt rightly, that thinks we have not all in him but onely by him? as if Chriſt only bare our ſins, and curſe, and then God by vertue thereof, gives his bleſſing immediately to us, ſo as we may have, yea, muſt have it by vertue of him, though we be not in him? ſure God did not onely abaſe his Son to bear all our ſins and burthens, and then give us the good by him immediately; but he that put all our evill upon him, put alſo all our good, that is, his grace and bleſſing into him, that we might have it with him, and not ſeparated from him. This then is a moſt certain truth, that Chriſt obtained redemption into himſelf, firſt, for us, ſo that it is with the Lord before we have it; and ſo forgiveneſſe of ſins for us, before we have it, the Apoſtle ſays, we are compleat in Chriſt, is that all one as compleat by him? I trow not, for we are not as yet compleat by him nor ſhall be till the reſurrection, except the Quakers be in the right, as they be not: but compleat we are now in him, and how can that be, if we have not in him forgiveneſſe of ſins, redemption and all bleſſing, even before we have them in our ſelves? they are in him for us, that we in receiving him, and being in him, might have them with him, ſo [he bleſt us in him according as he choſe us in him] is more then "he hath bleſt us "through him, or by means of him, or with reſpect to him, as Mr. "*Hacon* ſays of it: But what will Mr. *Hacon* ſtand to it, that God choſe us through Chriſt, or by means of, or with reſpect to him, as Mediator, that he gives that as the ſenſe of thoſe other phraſes? no ſurely, for he ſays preſently after, that "God in the firſt place "(ſo far as we may be able to make difference,) choſe his people to "ſalvation, and then in the next place, choſe Jeſus Chriſt to the "office of Mediator; having choſen his Church, he gave Jeſus "Chriſt to be their head, to bring them together and to hold them together, &c. This is downright, and contrary to *Zanchy*, and to himſelf, for if he choſe his Church and people, firſt to ſalvation, then they were his Church and people, ſo looke upon by him, before the conſideration of Chriſts mediation, which came after in the next place, and how then could the act of chuſing be, as he ſaid, even

Rom. 8. 32. *Pſal.* 136. 4.

now

now 'through and by means of, and with reſpect to him as Mediator? Could none of his Reverend Approvers, ſee this contradiction? Sure if it was through him, and with reſpect to him as Mediator, then that was conſidered before, and in the choice, if he underſtand reaſon, that cannot be through, and by means of another, that is, without reſpect to, and without the conſideration of the other. And ſo again he hath run into what he faulted me for; *viz.* ſeparated *elegit* from *in Chriſto*; the *choice* from *in Chriſt*, and put it to ſomething not mentioned in the Text, *Eph.* 1.4. for he 'would not have 'the choice to be in Chriſt, but only the bringing us to ſalvation, to 'be in or through Chriſt, and therefore thinks it interpretable by 'that in 1 *Theſ.* 5.9. God hath appointed us to obtain ſalvation, through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which is another buſineſſe, for he ſent his Son into the world, that the world through him might be ſaved or obtain ſalvation, *John* 3.17. Runs he not here again into what he wrongly faulted me in, for my deſcription of Election? takes he not here all the Articles of the Creed into Election? for what leſſe is in our obtaining ſalvation through Jeſus Chriſt, beſide what is the (*us*) there, in 1 *Theſ.* 5.9. is it not us who are in the light, beleevers? Or elſe all men in ſuch a ſenſe, as in *John* 3.17. before quoted; he appointed all men to obtain ſalvation through Chriſt conditionally, but the beleevers abſolutely; the world through him may be ſaved, the beleever through him ſhall be ſaved.

Sect. 4. But to prove Election to be perſonal (that is, upon their perſonal conſiderations, for otherwiſe I deny not perſons to be elected) he quotes *Rev.* 13.8. 'Names writ in the book of life of the Lamb, 'where a Book he ſays, is a Catalogue of Names, and Names are of perſons, &c. unhappy yet, for what gains he by this, more then is granted him? except what overthrows his own former conceit of the people of God, being choſen in the firſt place; for if ſo, how were they written in the Lambs book of life? yea, of the Lamb ſlain too? Could it be his Book or Catalogue, and yet writ before he as a Lamb was thought on, or conſidered? And who doubts but that names are of perſons? follows it therefore, it is of them in their perſonal conſiderations, as without Chriſt? ſurely that cannot be the ſenſe of *Rev.* 13. 8. that they were appointed to be ſaved, as conſidered in their own perſonal capacities as in themſelves, for it is ſaid there, That all the earth worſhipped the Beaſt, but they whoſe names

we

were written, &c. as implying that they did not worship him: Now evident it is, that many men considered as in themselves, and before conversion to Christ, do worship the Beast, that are after converted to Christ, and saved by him: Were not *Luther*, *Peter Martyr*, and many others such? Thinks he, no Papists or Idolaters may be converted and saved? Or were, or are their names (while such) written in that book? Then some whose names were in that Book worshipt the Beast, and the Apostle said not right in implying the contrary: But to that, and other places of the same import, I have spoken more largely and clearly in my *Essays*; the sum of what I said there, he pretends to give, but deals deceitfully, and injuriously in it; for I said not [Names written in that Book, are not those by which we call men, as *John*, *James*, &c. but their qualities in the general by which they may be called] for then Idolaters, Witches, Whoremongers should be there written too; but I said expresly next to that Negative [not such as *John*, *James*, &c.] but sometimes names are put for persons, *Acts* 1.20. And a little after, such persons as were so called and denominated (that is, righteous, godly, &c.) were the persons appointed by, and through Christ, &c. to be heirs of life: VVhat I said there, as I said it, is the genuine meaning of those often abused Scriptures beyond all contradiction, but he depraves and mis-represents my sayings, as he that compares them, with what he says of them, may see; and then says, 'they are in some contradicti-'on to my self, and in particular to *Ans.* 202. That we may not ga-'ther Gods love or Election from our duties of obedience, and inherent graces; but sure he either wants judgement in the nature of contradictions, or had lost it through passion or prejudice, when he thus wrote. Contradictions are ever *ad idem*, but suppose he had quoted me rightly, yet what he here quotes and oppose are of different natures: For is it all one to be known of God (as the writing our names relates to that) and to know our selves loved of God. He that says the act or fruit of Faith, is not that by which we know the object or ground of it (as that's the import of *Answ.* 202.) doth not contradict this, That God takes notice of, and approves them that beleeve aright; but both here, and in his Exceptions there to that Answer, he clearly mistakes me, as I shall evidence, when I come to it. Yea, that Answer he quotes implies the very contrary, to what he quotes it for, for in saying such a Faith (as I there men-

tion

Consentiunt illis omnes qui non scripti in lib o vitæ; proinde sine dubio non erunt consensuri qui scripti sunt. Aug. in Ps. 68. 28.

tion)is not a diſtinguiſhing Character of Gods Election, I imply that ſome other Faith is, *viz.* That which ſprings from his free love, diſcovered in his word to us, and that works by love, ſo that he is very unhappy in all his reaſonings, and allegations, and ſhews himſelf very void of judgement; not only unable to diſcern things far off him, but alſo to diſcern things before his eyes. But I ſhall ſpeak to that Anſwer, and his reaſonings againſt it in its place, waving his reaſonings againſt it here, though obvious enough to blame, becauſe I decline tediouſneſſe.

n.5. He ſays,' I confound qualities with names,qualities are not names, *&c.* But I ſaid not qualities are names, but that in Scripture men are ſometimes named from their qualities; the *wiſe in heart are called prudent*, Prov.16.21. Prudence is the quality, prudent the name, ſo that the confuſion is not in my ſaying,but in his miſtakes of them; proud and haughty ſcorner is his name,that deals with proud wrath, *Prov.* 21:24. Mr. *Hacon* will ſay no, thats not his name, but *Haman* or [illegible] &c. So he ſays, ' *Noah* was a righteous man, but that ' was not his name, *Moſes* a meek man, but that was not his name. *Anſ.* They had proper names given them amongſt men, and they had new names given them of God; and though meek and righteous,were not their appellatives with men, they were ſome of their new names with God; that the appellative names with men be their new names, and the names ever writ in the book of Life from the foundaton of the world, he proves not. *Luther* was *Luthers* name, when a Monkiſh Idolater, was that his new name, or name written in the Lambs book of life? Sure then the names of Beaſt-worſhippers may be there too as well as others: That *Clements* name was writ in the book of Life, is granted, but that the name *Clement* was that name, he proves not, no more then that the name Jeſus is that name of Jeſus that every knee ſhould bow to,as ſome people miſconceive; it is not which names are written in the book of Life, but whoſe names: So that in all this Exception alſo, he hath but beat the air, and diſcovered his own miſtakes, and nothing elſe.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

Except. 16. *About Jacob and Esau.*

Sect. 1 ABout the Election of *Jacob* & rejection of *Esau*, I said, the Scripture says, not that they were either personally, nor to and from salvation; by personal, evidently meaning, as considered in their own persons without Christ; or also, as respecting their single persons only: But that they respected their posterities and nations also, and so could not be the same with that election spoken of in *Eph.* 1.4. except as a type. To this he says, 1. Let 'it be so, yet it shews God is free in his choice, in that they who are 'every way alike, are not alike dealt withall, whether it be in world-'ly blessings, or spiritual, or eternal. *Rep.* That God is free in his choice is granted, and my definition asserted; that [redacted] God deals not in eternal blessings alike, with like persons it cannot shew, if it speak not of choice to salvation. I hope he thinks not God will send some beleevers to heaven, and others to hell, to deal unlike, with like persons in eternal blessings.

Sect. 2. He says, 'Their Election and Rejection were personal, (that is, their persons were included in those Decrees) who doubted it? I expressly said so, yet not personally in the senses above expressed. That *Esau was profane, and sold his birthright*, proves not either that that rejection of him mentioned, was from eternal salvation, or to eternal damnation; or that that purpose reached not to him Nationally considered, and therefore is impertinent: Nor doth its being said, *That God hated Esau*, prove either of those things: for if that was meant only of his person to eternal destruction, what evidence of Gods love to *Israel* then in *Malachies* time living, could that be? as to prove that it is brought, *Mal.* 1.1,2. *Jacob* might have been elected to eternal life, and *Esau* rejected from it, and they those *Israelites* never the lesse hated: Nor can such a hatred of *Esau* before he had done good or evill (had the Scripture so expreſt it, as it doth not) be synonymous with being hardned: What? was hee hardned before he was born? Or was he there a vessel of wrath more then *Paul*, or any other after beleevers? *Eph.* 2. 3. *who were by*

nature

nature children of wrath as well as others. That "the Apostle "proves thence, that some of *Abrahams* children may be reiected, "may be children of the flesh, and not of God, or of the promise, is granted, nor went I about in the least to make that void: for I think none of them were children of the promise, especially taken as they are of *Abrahams* flesh; and I know many of them are for their unbelief broken off from what they were in *Abraham* or *Jacob* chosen to, though of their flesh.

Sect. 3. I said, *Jacob* and his posterity were chosen to be priviledged with the choise means of salvation above all Nations, and therein God gave him dominion, *&c.* "This (he says) moves wonder why so great weight should be laid upon the greater "or lesse means of salvation; by them who hold that all men in the "world have sufficient means of salvation. *Reply.* Admiration is often the daughter of ignorance indeed, but let him ask the Apostle *Paul*, why he makes that the chief advantage of the *Jew*, and profit of the circumcision, that to them was committed the Oracles of God; when as he said a little before in effect (which was there the occasion of that question, what profit then hath the *Jews*? as well as here of this wonder) that all other Nations had means sufficient for their salvation: for he had said, *Rom.* 2. that Gods goodnesse and forbearance leads them to repentance; that not having the Law outwardly, they are a Law to themselves; that by nature keeping or doing the things of the Law, their uncircumcision shall be counted for circumcision; and the *Jews* and circumcision breaking the Law should be accounted as uncircumcised, God being no respecter of persons, but upon the like terms accepting, or rejecting both *Jew* and *Gentile*. *Verse* 4,5,6,7,8,9. 12. 14, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29. Yet we see the Apostle (all this notwithstanding) makes that the great advantage of the *Jews* their being priviledged with the Oracles of God, in which they had more means to know God, and so to attain more peculiar joys and satisfactions, and were honoured to be choise instruments of glorifying God to others, *Rom.* 3. 1. As the servants that attended on *Solomon*, and about his Court, were far more happy then remoter subjects, with reference to their participation of his wisdom; but may it not be wondred rather, that this man should make such a wonder at it, who a little before interpreted, *Psal.* 65 4. of choise to be the visible Church, and so made them that be of it blessed?

Sect. 4. He ſays, "*Jacob* and *Eſau* were brought up in the ſame "family, and religion, and partakers of the ſame ſeal; and ſo far "not differenced. *Reply.* That's impertinent, ſeeing I ſhewed by 4. reaſons (which he ſays nothing to) that the ſpeech is of them nationally taken. And in *Rom.* 9.4,5. he may ſee wherein *Jacob* was nationally differenced above *Eſau* and all others; and *Jacob* was perſonally differenced in this, That he was the head of that Nation, and had ſuch Oracles of God revealed to him, as *Eſau* had not.

Sect. 5. He quarrels with me again, for not uſing the common tearms of divinity: Is not means of ſalvation ſuch a term? Oh but he makes a skip from this *Anſwer*, back to my Title page, and ſays, that ſpake of Election, and this *Anſwer* of being priviledged with the choiſe means. *Reply.* Nay, it ſpeaks of choice to ſuch a priviledge, and is that external vocation? is not *choice* Election? did not he call it an Election to be the Church viſible, *p.* 76? doth that of our Saviour, Many are called, but few the choſen, make any thing more againſt my calling this *choice* Election, then it makes againſt his ſo calling it?

He ſays, "St. *Paul* here ſhews the difference betwixt the Church vi- "ſible and inviſible, that all are not *Iſrael* that are of *Iſrael*, becauſe "God chuſeth and refuſeth whom he will of thoſe who belong "to the Church, and partake of the outward call. *Reply.* Though "this be ſaid without proof, eſpecially as to that word [becauſe] yet in a ſober ſenſe it may be granted; but then its to be minded, that though *Paul* diſtinguiſhes the Church inviſible from the viſible, and not between *Iſraelites* and *Ethnicks*, &c. yet he doth this in order to clear Gods juſtice, in breaking off *Iſrael* as to many branches from being the viſible Church (I ſuppoſe Mr. *Hacon* will not ſay they were broken off, from being of the inviſible) that they being not all choſen to be of the inviſible, and heirs of their promiſe (but onely they that were born of the promiſe) he might juſtly break them off, from being of the viſible for their unbelief; and ſtumbling at the ſtumbling ſtone, as *verſe* 30,31, &c. And that as God had freely, without reſpect to their goodneſſe, choſen them to be his peculiar people and viſible Church; ſo he might for their unbelief reject them, and chuſe in the *Gentiles* into their place, though they neither had birth nor works to commend them.

Sect. 6.

Sect. 6. He ſays, "I ſhould have ſhewed that there is no other Love "or Hatred, ſpoken of in theſe 3. Chapters, then Gods offering to "ſome the choiſe means of ſalvation, & to others but ordinary and "common means; and that to ſhew mercy, and harden are the ſame, "with affording choiſe and ordinary means. *Reply.* 1. The *Queſtion* was about *Jacob* and *Eſau*, and not about all the three Chapters: therefore neither ſhould the *Anſwer* (eſpecially in a Catechiſme for children) ſpeak to all things in them; nor finde I the words Love or Hatred mentioned in them but there. 2. Yet I ſpake of other love and hatred then he mentions; for I ſpake not of offering choiſe means only, but of priviledging them with them, ſo as to give them dominion therein, as the ſetting up as it were a tabernacle for thoſe means amongſt them & making them the viſible Church: like that of *Peter*, Act. 15. 11. The taking out a people for his Name, not to exclude all others from ſalvation, but that the reſidue of men might ſeek God there, and by means of them. Therefore what follows in him, "of the Church of the old Teſtament, leſſe loved then we of "the New; and the Kings and Prophets, who deſired to ſee Chriſts "day leſſe then the Apoſtles; and *Capernaum* more then *Tyre* and *Sidon*, and all that which to the ſame purpoſe he ſays, about veſſels of honour and diſhonour, being by me all one with perſons, having greater and leſſer means, as if the leſſe degree meerly made a veſſel of diſhonour, in *Except.* 18. *p.* 93, 94, 95. are meer prevarications and miſtakes. Though in the inſtances above mentioned, they might in ſome ſenſe be ſaid to be more or leſſe loved, as love ſignifies manifeſtation of love in outward acts of it, or priviledge and dignity conferred. 3. To ſhew mercy, and harden, are quite from the buſineſſe, except he will ſay, that God hardned *Eſau* nationally, or before he was born. They belong to perſons who have actually ſinned and deſerved hardning; and (as God pleaſes) that notwithſtanding are neither hardned or finde mercy with him, "that God hardneth thoſe he ſends the beſt means to, *&c.* Is true "ſometimes, but impertinent, becauſe againſt nothing that I af-"firmed. Nor belonged it to me, to ſhew that there is no Election or rejection ſpoken of in all that diſcourſe: Its enough that I proved what I aſſerted about the place objected; It was his part to have ſhewed, that thoſe two perſons are not nationally there ſpoken of; or that *Jacob* was elected to ſalvation out of Chriſt, and

Esau ordained to damnation, without respect to his rejecting Christ.

Sect. 7. "That the *Israelites* were for number as the sand of the "Sea, yet but a remnant saved, and that God foreknew that remnant, and the Election had obtained, are truths: but its to be minded, that the Apostle speaks not in my adversaries language; for they say, the elect shall obtain as including uncalled persons in the elect but the Apostle, the Election hath obtained, as speaking of called and believing persons onely; and these indeed were foreknown of God, whom his grace, and the Election according to it of the seed called in *Isaac* had obtained its effect in, and these were chosen to eternall life, out of them who were chosen to the choise means without all doubt, so many of them as were of that people; yea, the Election to the choise means was, that they might be brought in to Christ, and be means of bringing others in to him too, in whom the Election is which obtains. I might retort his conclusion then upon himself; but I passe it, and proceed to his next exception.

CHAP. XVIII.

Except. 17. *About Pharaoh.*

Oncerning *Pharaoh* I asked; Saye not the Scripture, that God made *Pharaoh* to destroy him? He quarrels nextly with that *Question*, as if I plaid "the Minus in it, and in a scoffing imi-"tation put not a proper *Question*, but a figu-"rative interogatiou, crudely enough and invidiously. Big words without cause or proof! Might not the Papists have as colourably taxed that of the reformed Churches Catechise, *Question* 30. *Credimne igitur illi in unicum servatorem Jesum qui à sanctis aut à se aut aliunde felicitatem aut salutem quærunt*? what scoffing imitation was my *Question* guilty of more then that? or what crudity or envy in it? are there not many that gives that as the sense of those Scriptures. He in effect saya no, in "saying, the pretended Orthodox never

"never ſaid more in it then the Scriptnre ſaith, *viz.* That God "raiſed up *Pharaoh* to ſhew his wrath upon him for his own glo-ry. *Reply.* 1. Thats more then the Scripture ſaith, it ſaith, only that God raiſed him up to ſhew his power, and that his name might be declared in all the earth; power and wrath are not the ſame, *Rom.* 19.17. Indeed in *verſe* 22. the Apoſtle ſays, What if God, willing to ſhew his wrath and make known his power, endured with much long-ſuffering the veſſels of wrath fitted for deſtruction? But 1. An interrogation is not an aſſertion: perhaps Mr. *Hacon* may call it a ſcoffing intimation, but far be it from him. 2. Though it intimately imply an aſſertion, its rather *de jure quàm de facto*, of what God may do, then of what he doth. 3. Nor doth he name *Pharaoh* there, though it ſeems to be ſpoken with reference to him, But 4. However to endure with much long-ſuffering a veſſel of wrath fitted for deſtruction, and to raiſe up one to ſhew his wrath on him, are very different, eſpecially in the ſenſe of the pretended Orthodox, that render it by *feci, creavi, poſui:* wherein. 2. They ſay more then ſimply God raiſ d him up to ſhew his wrath on him. Zanchy interprets it thus, *in hoc ipſum te finxi, in hoc ipſum in lucem te produxi*, &c. For this purpoſe I formed thee, or I brought thee into the world, and that *that* and I *made, created, ordained* thee, do materially differ from *reſerving, preſerving* or *keeping till now*, and ſo from *enduring with much long-ſuffering* then *fitted to deſtruction*, I appeal to common reaſon and the indifferent reader. *De excæcatione impiorum quæſt.* 3.

Sect. 2. He addes, "They that give that ſenſe of making, creating, "&c. do think it ſuits beſt with *Prov.* 16. The Lord hath made the "wicked for the day of evill; and that the Apoſtles words, *Rom.* 9. "ſuits beſt with it *verſe* 17. and there is nothing againſt it *verſe* 22. "they think the Apoſtle may explain himſelf *verſe* 20. Why haſt "thou made me thus *verſe* 21. of the ſame lump to make. *Reply.* 1. To that in *Prov.* 16.4. the words may as well be read by an uſual Ellipſis of the word (*are*) thus, and the wicked *are* for the day of evil, where the *day of evil* probably means the day of affliction, in which God brings evill among his people or upon the earth; then God makes uſe of wicked men as his inſtruments, as *Iſa.* 10 5. O *Aſſyrian* the rod of mine anger, &c. clear it is, that God made none wicked; nor can it be; that he either made any that they they might be wicked, or that they might however be deſtroyed, who ſweare he

he hath no pleaſure in the death of the wicked, but rather that they turn and live, *Ezek.* 33.11. had he made any to deſtruction, he ſhould have likement that righteous perſons (for ſo was man made) ſhould dye, and to that end become wicked, but 2. To all thoſe places, the words פעל, ποιεῖν *facere*, to *make*, are in Scripture applied to a providentiall working, operation or diſpoſing, different from the firſt creating or bringing into the world: the word *Phagnal* is uſually ſo, ſee *Iſa.* 26.12. *Pſal.* 5,6. and 7.14. the other words are applied to that too, ſignally in *Jer.* 18.3,4 6. where Gods providentiall working, framing the ſtate of, or dealing with *Iſrael*, is compared to the Potters making a veſſell upon the wheel; and when it was broken, making it another veſſel: and its probable the Apoſtle alludes to that. Cannot I do with you as this Potter, Oh houſe of *Iſrael*? that is, Cannot I turn again and make you how and what I *pleaſe*? And again, *you are* (not onely ye were, when I made *Adam*, or in the womb) *in my hand as the clay in the hand of the Potter*. As if he had ſaid, I have not ſo tyed my hands either in making you at the firſt, or in my Election of you, or decree againſt you, that I cannot either make you veſſels of honour, yea, and deſtroy you if you yet rebell, or make you veſſels of honour notwithſtanding I have framed evill againſt you, if you repent. So *Iſa.* 64 8. *We are the clay* (not onely we were) *thou art the Potter*: So then God hath made or wrought the wicked (that repent not) for the day of evil, either to be inſtruments of inflicting wrath, or to be filled with evill to deſtruction; and God hath power over the ſame lump (men in the ſame condition, or of the ſame people or parents (either at firſt to frame and diſpoſe one to honour, and another to ſervitude or diſhonour, as *Jacob* and *Eſau* of *Iſaac*; or having both alike rebelled, to make one to honour (as *Iſrael* though they had made the golden calf, and heavily provoked God) they repenting, as *Jer.* 18.11. or to diſhonour and miſery, as *Pharaoh*; nor may any in any ſuch caſe ſay, *Why haſt thou made me thus?* yet this comes ſhort of juſtifying their interpretation, that ſay, God created or made, that is, framed in the womb, and brought *Pharaoh* into the world, to ſhew his wrath in his damnation. The 17. and 22. *verſes* were conſidered above.

פעל operatus eſt, egit, fecit, reſpondet Græco ἐργάζομαι. Leig. Crit. Sacr.

Sect. 3. He preferrs the Septuagints meaning, as that which ſound interpreters follow, "*viz.* of keeping from (I ſuppoſe he would "ſay preſerving under and from periſhing in) former judgements.

Reply.

"Reply. That agrees well with my *Answer*, but how it can justifie the cause of the others, that take it otherwise, I see not; or how it can stand with it, for that cause is not as he represents it, "The "freedom of Gods power and Soveraignty to dispose of his crea-"ture to his glory; either by shewing mercy or hardning, but that God doth or did, or that it was for his glory to create and appoint some men to wrath without the consideration, or antecedently to the consideration of their rejection of, or rebellion against God and Christ, that *the Apostle might apply that saying further then to Pharaoh*, is without doubt; that he *misapplied* it to a case wholly unlike it, is not to be imagined.

CHAP. XIX.

Exception 18. *About Gods making vessels to honour and dishonour.*

Sect. 1. Quest. and *Ans.* 146. say, That the Scripture in saying, God hath power as a Potter, to make of the same lump, &c. Shews that God may do what he will with his own; distribute to them what he pleaseth, preferring one before another in means of salvation, forbearance towards them, or power exercised for their good, as I instanced in *Jacob* and *Esau*. To this he

1. Layes aside the two first expressions, containing the *Answer* fullest, and most generally, and onely pitches upon the following expressions, relating more particularly, to *Rom.* 9. And to the case of *Jacob* and *Esau*, though by way of accomodation, applicable to others. And then he

2. *Mistakes* and abuses the rest; his mistake of preferring in the means of salvation; as if it signified only an offering more means, we noted above in *Excep.* 16. besides which he mistakes, forbearance from destruction (as in *Jacob*, when not consumed, when *Esau's* mountains were laid wast) as if I meant it of forbearance from correction and chastisement, ~~in~~ which are means of salvation, in which the honoured

honoured have the first place too, as *judgement must begin at the house of God*, 1 Pet. 4. 16. *You have I known of all the families of the earth, therefore will I punish you*, &c. *Amos* 2. 3. and power for their good, which I intended of the stretching out his arm in, and with the means of salvation, after an especiall manner he mistakes for outward aid, *p.* 97. And upon those mistakes, he prevaricates in his 3. first Exceptions, as if I had said, the very lesser degree of means and chastisements, and outward aid, made a man a vessel of dishonour, and as if I put all upon the edge of the instrument or weapon, without the strength of the hand, *p.* 95. Those I passe then as so many prevarications; as also that in the entrance upon the 4th. that I interpret a vessel of honour, upon which any houour is conferred, when as I spake onely of divine hõnour, and in things heavenly or relating thereunto. The rest I shall view, though they too much lean also, upon those mistakes.

Sect. 2. He says, I interpret a vessel of honour to be one honoured with "temporary and transitory honour; and so as *Judas*, when "an unbeliever, a thief and a Devil was notwithstanding a vessell "of honour: against which he notes, that this prepositiõn *in*, (in "*honorem & in contumeliam*, not *of* but *to* honour and *to* dishonour) "being a final particle denoting the end, cannot otherwise well be "taken, then to denote a finall state and permanent condition. *Reply.* This observation about the prepositiõn being as the basis that upholds the building, if it be disproved, the rest falls to nothing; now I shall not need to go far to disprove that the Apostles *simile* will do it: the Potter makes a vessell *in honorem*, to or for honour, thats his finall end, yet it may be marred on the wheel, and he may turn it, and make it another vessel, *Jer.* 18. 3, 4. The prepositiõn *in* will not secure its honour to it, or it may afterwards be broken; or were it a voluntary agent, might misbehave it self, and so be put to viler service, as *Isa.* 30. 14. So we read *Isa.* 14. 2. of taking persons *in servos & in ancillas*, for servants and hand maids: Must they therefore be ever so, May they not be made free? and so *Judas* might be made a vessel to honour (sure Christ chose him not to dishonour) before he was a thief or Devil, though he by playing the thief became a Devil, and lost his honour and office; the end to which a thing is made or designed and its duration therein a very different; yea, and that may intentionally be more permenent, which eventually is transient

ſient, as Paradiſe was made for a longer delight to man, then he by his ſinning did enjoy it, and the woman for a meet help longer then ſhe ſo continued, that the Apoſtle explains *verſe* 22. The veſſels of diſhonour, to be veſſels made up to deſtruction, I believe not; I am ſure he ſays it not; diſhonour and deſtruction are very different, though deſtruction is with diſhonour, yet diſhonour is not always attended with deſtruction. *Eſau* was a veſſel to diſhonour becauſe to ſervitudes, yet I finde not that he was made therein to deſtruction; *Pharaoh* indeed was made providentially to both, but I take it *verſe* 21. relates rather to *Jacob* and *Eſau*, different veſſels out of the ſame lump, the 22. to *Pharaoh*, and the unbelieving *Iſraelites* broken off.

Sect. 3. In the 5. He ſays, according to the tenour of my *Anſwer*, the ſame perſon may "be both a veſſell to honour and diſho-"nour, not onely ſucceſſively, but alſo at the ſame time, a veſſel of "honour becauſe preferred before ſome others, and of diſhonour "becauſe ſome others preferred before him. *Reply.* This ſpring-eth of his former miſtake of me, as if I put the being of a veſſel to honour, or diſhonour, meerly in the greater or leſſer degree of thoſe favours, its evident my *Anſwer* ſpake rather to what a veſſel of ho-nour is, then of diſhonour; and I acknowledge ſomething poſitive in the diſhonoured, beſide a leſſer degree meerly, and therefore ſaid not in my *Anſwer*, *the leſſe honoured*, but the *diſhonoured*; as *Eſau* had not onely leſſe of thoſe means and favours ſpecified then *Jacob*, but he had not at all committed to him thoſe means *Jacob* had, though from and by *Jacob* he might have had the benefit of them; & he alſo was ſubjected to ſervitude as *Jacob* was not, beſides, where the ſpeech is but of two, as one to honour and another to diſhonour; neither can be with reſpect to both, though were ſuch a thing aſ-ſerted comparatively (that *Ruben* ſuppoſe was a veſſel of diſhonour in compariſon to *Judah*, and yet a veſſel of honour in compariſon of *Eſau*.) I ſee no great inconvenience in it, the ſame perſons as the Father and Mother may in diverſe reſpects be both loved and hated, *Luke* 14.26. and why not in different reſpects to honour, and diſ-honour; if God p'eaſes.

§. 4. He objects again, "That its unlikely that either Jew or Gen-"tile ſhould charge God with injuſtice; or the Apoſtle defend his "Juſtice, if nothing but that had been objected, that God uſeth

"some men better then others in the things specified. *Rep.* The objection of injustice might be upon a twofold account. As, 1. That God should deal unlike with like persons, in appointing one to honour, and the other to dishonour or servitude. Or 2. That (and that rather) he should reiect those whom before he had so freely chosen to honour, as *Jacob* Nationally was. And the Apostle shews Gods Justice in both, in his Soveraigntie over his creatures, as the Potters over the clay. Thence he might dispose differently of like persons, as to honour and dishonour; and he might harden or shew more mercy also to sinners alike sinful. They being not by vertue of that choice or honour, the subjects of his absolute Promises of life eternal; he might for their unbelief and rebellion reject and harden them, his said former love to, and choice of them notwithstanding; his foreknown ones, or such as in whom the Election had obtained, being only the subjects, not so to be dealt with by him, *i.e.* the believers in Christ.

Qui verò se-ipsum excæcari, indurari, vel saltem non sicut alterum illuminari, descendat in semetipsum & ibi, i.e. in seipso inveniat causam suæ indurationis suam esse peccatum, suam pertinaciam: eam deploret, detestetur, veniam petat, supplicet se liberari & emolliri, si fortè Dominus misereatur. De Excæc. & imp. quæst. 3.

Sect. 5. Lastly, he falsely supposes, that I implie, its in a mans own power to make himself otherwise even as he will, notwithstanding what God hath done. For I gave no ground for such a collection, but the contrary; for I said, the honoured abusing their honour were broken off (that was Gods act, not theirs) and the dishonoured were made vessels of mercie through faith in Jesus Christ; not made themselves so. Nay, in my next answer I clearly denied, that any man could bring himself to that faith, in and by which he is so made, so that thats a slander: yet that he who is a vessel to honour, may deserve to be made otherwise; and he that is a vessel to dishonour repenting, may finde such favour as to be made otherwise by God, I think, *Jer.* 18.3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12. strongly implies. And me thinks *Zanchy* too, though an absolute Reprobatarian, hath a passage stronglie inclining to such a conception; for speaking of the ends of Gods hardening the wicked, he says, He that perceives himself to be blinded, hardned, or not so illuminated at least as another, let him descend into himself, and there (namely in himself) he may finde the cause of his hardening; that is to say, his sinne and obstinacie. Let him bewail that, let him detest it, let him ask pardon of it, let him supplicate to be delivered and softened, if *perhaps* the Lord may have mercie on him.

Sect. 6. "That the rule of our belief teacheth us otherwise then I said,

he

he saith; but proves not: nor repeats he rightly what our belief says: for it is not in *Rom.* 9.11. Gods Purpose of Election doth stand and abide firme, but his purpose according to Election, which *I* deny not: take it for his purpose, according to any Election, his purpose alters not, though persons whom he chose may be cast away as *Judas*; And *Deut.* 7. 6,11,12,13. with 8. 19,20. they may fall under another purpose, but his purpose changes not, but stands fast. So the Apostle supposes, he might possibly have done as well as *Judas*, or any of the Fathers in the wildernesse, should he not have kept his body in subjection, 1 *Cor.* 9. 27. and 10. 1 — 5.6. His counsel is immutable indeed towards the heires of Promise, it follows not, that the heires of Promise are so too; or that all that he makes vessels of honour, are heires of his choicest absolute Promises: "That "the vessels of honour and dishonour are no more interchangeable, "then Gold and Silver, Wood and Earth, of which they are made, 2 *Tim.* 2. 20. is rashly said; for it 1. Supposes a difference in the matter of the vessels, but the Apostle here speaks of different vessels, from or of the same lump. 2. The Apostle says there, if a man cleanse himself from these, he shall be a vessel to honour, that must either signifie, that he that is not so, may be made so, upon such termes; not make himself so, but be made so by Gods grace, theres a change: or else, that he that is so, shall be (that is, shall continue) so if he cleanse himself; and then that supposes, unlesse he do so he may not, but may fall away with *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, &c. either way it implies an interchangeablenesse. 3. Did Mr. *Hacon* never reade, *Thy silver is become drosse, Isa.* 1. 22. *And I planted thee a noble Vine, holy, a right seed, how then art thou become to me as a degenerate plant of a strange Vine?* Jer. 2. 21.

O 2 CHAP.

CHAP. XX.

Exception 19. *About Gods Works preaching Christs Mediation.*

Sect. 1. REmove we but three or foure Prævarications or Paralogiſmes, or *Elenchi ignorationes*, from his next Exception (which is about Gods works, ſpeaking obſcurely Chriſts mediation) and the whole Exception comes to nothing.

I ſaid, the works of God ſpeak Chriſts mediation, not diſtinctly but obſcurely, as the effect ſpeaks ſome hidden cauſe, or the work the Workman: in that they ſpeak that goodneſſe of God, which could not have been toward us, had not Chriſt interpoſed between God and us; ſo that as the death of men ſpeaks the ſin of *Adam*, ſo they ſpeak Chriſts mediation: About this (after ſome revilings of it, and ſome good conceſſions, as that "his Mediation is not only ſufficient, that is, potentially efficacious, but alſo actually efficacious for all men in the world, whether they come to know any thing of him or no: yea, for the other creatures alſo, ſo far as to that mixture and meaſure of mercie, which they enjoy, &c.) He commits theſe Paralogiſmes.

Sect. 2. 1. He argues from mens not knowing to Gods works, not manifeſting, or ſpeaking thus; "So much is not known to all men "by means of the works or creatures of God, but to ſome only, and "that by meanes of his Word; therefore ~~Chriſts interpoſing as a "generall Mediator, and~~ Gods Works being ordered or conſerved "as they are, ſignifie or ſpeak not of his Mediation: Which is ſuch an Argument, as if I ſhould ſay, the Sun doth not ſhine becauſe I do not ſee it; or no man knows ſo much as the Scriptures ſpeaks, therefore they ſpeak not what they do ſpeak; nay, rather what is known to any to be held forth in the creatures or providences of God, though they know it but by means of his word, that is certainly held forth in, and by them, whether many or few, or none elſe knew it, for the word of God is true; nor doth the creatures ſpeak thus much becauſe the word ſayes they do, but the word ſayes they

do

do becauſe they do, a man may ſpeak what no body heare, their not hearing makes not falſe that ſuch a man ſpeaks.

Sect. 3. A ſecond Paralogiſme is, from the effect or none effect of his mediation; to the works of God not ſpeaking his mediation, thus: this mediation availeth only, and extendeth onely, to temporall and worldly benefits, not to ſalvation or eternal life; *ergo*, the works of God ſpeak not that mediation, that tends to eternal life, which is a notable *non ſequitur*, if there were any ſenſe or truth in the firſt propoſition, for it implies two mediations, one conducing to eternal life, the other only to worldly benefits: whereas I know of no ſuch diſtinction in the Scriptures, except he mean there is a mediation for the beaſts preſervation, and that that is not to their life eternal which I think is new divinity; but if ſo, yet that is for the good of mankinde, and the goodneſſe of God, to man teſtified towards him in ſuch favours, leads him alſo to repentance, and that tends to ſalvation and life eternal to man, *Rom.* 2.4.5. *Pſal.* 36.7.8. Gods preſerving man and beaſt is included in that loving kindneſſe of God, that invites to truſt under his wings, and that leads to glorious ſatisfaction, ſo in *Job.* 5.8,9. Gods wonderful works in giving rain, and in defeating the counſels of the wicked, and ſaving the poor, leads the poor to have hope in God, and that leads to ſalvation; and all this is through Chriſts mediation, but ſuppoſe, there be two ſuch mediations as he implieth, follows it that the works of God teſtifie not of both, becauſe one of them reſpecteth onely outward benefits, and not ſalvation? his argument is after this rate, as if one ſhould ſay, Chriſts meditates not for the Scriptures that they ſhould have everlaſting life, but only ſhould be preſerved outwardly with men, therefore they ſpeak nothing of everlaſting life, Chriſt mediated *ſuppoſe* for *Iudas* (according to their principles) for outward temporall mercies onely, therefore *Iudas* ſaid nothing about eternal ſalvation brought to men by Chriſts mediation; beſides, I ſhewed in my next Anſwer, how the works of God conduces to mens believing, and that paſſes current without exception amongſt the Anſwers of his commendation; and yet here becauſe ſome kinde of mediation that he fancies, brings not men to faith or to ſalvation, therefore he concludes that Gods works ſpeak nothing of Chriſts mediation.

Sect. 4. A third is from the Heathens, not receiving the clearer

light of the Gospel, therefore they had not before any thing of Christs mediation held forth in Gods works. Thus, "if Heathen "persons, by means of the creatures, were brought to know Christ "a Saviour, though more obscurely, then when Christ a Saviour is "evidently taught they would have entertained him, but when he "was evidently taught they refused him, and counted his Gospel "foolishnesse, as when *Paul* preacht at *Athens*, the Philosophers, and "even the *Stoicks* the best of them rejected him; Therfore they did not "know him before, no, not so much as obscurely, the same he hath "again in effect, p. 104. adding how could that be seen by the les-"ser light that was not seen of them, by the greater arising and "shining on them? which arguments are both notoriously guilty, of misconcluding, in that instead of concluding against the works of God speaking of Christs mediation; they conclude, against the Heathens seeing it, and knowing Christ, and being brought to know Christ a Saviour, &c. Which are notable *ignorationes elenchi*, or missings of the mark, and they are guilty of many other faults, being notable Paralogismes; for. 1. By the same way of arguing it might be concluded, that Christ was not held forth in the Scriptures, because when he was clearly preacht to the *Iews*, they more generally rejected him then the *Gentiles*, and the *Pharisees*, and High Priests, more generally then the Philosophers. 2. It might be retorted many of the *Gentiles* did receive him readily, when clearlier preached, therefore they had some obscure knowledge of him before. 3. It follows not that because the Philosophers had most learning, therefore they must needs be best at seeing what was in the works of God to be seen, their wisdom perverted them, and their pride *and* conceit blinded them, *Rom.* 1.21,22. the humblest souls are usually best at seeing, even as there be many poor despised illiterate men, that see more into Christ and Heaven, then many proud Ministers, Schollars, and University men, that swell with conceits of their science, and despise them. I remember my reverend Tutor Mr. *Henry Hall* of *Trinity* Colledge once said to us his pupills, we sit here (speaking of the University fellows) poreing on our books, & filling our selves with notions (or to that purpose) when the poor Coun-
Or Mini-sters. *trey-men, run away with the true and heavenly understanding. I am sure many Lay-men, that cannot read Latin, could see the faults of Mr. *Hacons* argdings, when both himself (and if I may credit re-

ports

ports) divers Univerſity men, were not ſo good at ſeeing them, over much light makes ſome men almoſt, if not altogether blinde. 4. If that way of arguing was good (ſuch perſons ſee not, or they rejected, therefore there was nothing to be ſeen, no ſuch thing ſpoken) it would make as much againſt the fulleſt, faithfulleſt, and moſt credible publication of the Goſpel by the Apoſtles, that they ſpeak nothing of Chriſts glory and grace: for the Philoſophers as ſoon as any rejected their preaching, and ſaw no glory in it, nor truth worthy their embracing, but Gods ſpeaking it not to be meaſured by mens perceiving. 5. A man may ſee more by candlelight, then a blinde man can ſee, or a wilful man will perhaps ſee by the Sun light ſhining in its fuller light and ſplendor, ſo that every way thoſe arguings be vitious, whether Mr. *Hac.* ſee it or not.

Sect. 5. 4. A fourth is, they not ſpeaking of Chriſt diſtinctly, therefore not obſcurely, a grand Paralogiſme, and to make that the concluſion of his arguments (they ſpeak not of Chriſt diſtinctly) is a great miſsonclusion; yet ſo he doth, when he ſays, "the Goſpel "being tidings, *muſt* be *brought*, and being *news*, muſt be *told*, before "it can be known; and being *tendred* by way of *covenant*, implies "a neceſſity that *notice* be given to the parties concerned; faith in "Chriſt comes by hearing, our redemption is taught us in the "School of Chriſt, *p.* 102. No myſtery is known by nature, the "Goſpell is a myſtery or ſecret which none of the Princes of the "world knew (which halts alſo of the diſeaſe before diſcovered, argues from mens not knowing to their not ſhewing) & more plainly, in *p.* 104, 105. when he ſays, "they ſhew *qualis* but not *quis*, not his "name; or if his name, not his diſpoſition and moral character, or if "that, not his will and Teſtament, (and yet preſently after, he ſays "in effect they ſhew his diſpoſition for they witneſſe of his goodneſs, "he ſays, his eternal power and Godhead; and yet by and by croſs to that he ſays they ſhew not his nature, as if his goodneſſe was not his nature) they ſhew not who he is, nor "that he is the God of "*Abraham*, *Iſaac*, *Jacob*, that brought *Iſrael* out of *Egypt*, nor the "perſons of the Trinity, & therefore not the ſecond perſon or Mediator, nor his will how he muſt be worſhipped, *&c.* Much leſſe his "Goſpel and Covenant of grace that he made, and that by way of "Teſtament with his Church, *&c.* All which is in effect either the ſame I ſaid, that is, that they ſpeak not of him diſtinctly; and then

he

he hath but prevaricated in oppoſing thoſe things againſt what I ſaid, or elſe he ſays falſely, for though they ſay, not how many Perſons there be in the Trinity, yet if they ſhew not the Perſons in the Trinity, they ſhew not God, ſeeing God is the Perſons in the Trinity, and the Perſons in the Trinity, all of them are the God whoſe name and nature (though not diſtinctly the ſyllables of it) they witneſs.

Sect. 6. Theſe Paralogiſmes and prevarications, being removed, there is little left but miſtake and falſhood, as where he asks "do the Sun, Moon, Stars, together "with other works of Gods creation, "ſpeak any other language now then before the fall of man, to which "he ſays it muſt be anſwered no, as the Sun doth ſhine alike at this "day upon the juſt and unjuſt, ſo it did upon *Adam* while he was in "Paradiſe, and when he was thence excluded, all things continue "alike from the beginning of the creation, 2 *Pet.* 3. *Reply.* There be very many faults in thoſe words. 1. That he excludes the works of providence, and mentions onely thoſe of creation, whereas they are moſt conſiderable in this matter and were by me expreſly mentioned. 2. That he tyes me up to what I muſt *Anſwer* to his *Queſtion*, when as I would ſay the direct contrary; yes, they do. 3. He boldly avers what he knows not, that the Sun-ſhine upon *Adam* in Paradiſe, as it did after, as if no alteration befel the creatures & their influences upon mans fall. 4. It is a Paralogiſme thence to conclude if it did ſhine alike upon *Adam* fallen, as upon him innocent, therefore it ſpake no other language, for if it did ſo, it ſpake God good, and kinde to ſinners contrary to what their ſin deſerved; and ſo it never could ſpeak him before, therefore another language. 5. He brings the ſaying of the ſcoffers to confirm his aſſertion, and juſtifies the truth of it, when as the Apoſtle tells us, even that ſaying proceeded out of their wilfull ignorance, and minds them that ſince the creation of the world all things did not continue alike; for God overflowed the creation with a flood, and deſtroyed the world, the face and form of it as before it was. however clear it is, that the works of God, preach God both offended againſt man for his ſin, and yet propitious and good to man, although he be ſinfull, yea, and * the Heathen diſcerned it too, and that language they could never preach before the fall, and therefore not before Chriſts Mediation.

So Juvenal *Crudelior eſt in his homo quam ſibi.*

Sect. 7. When he ſays, "The characters of divine providence "though

"though not very dim to be diſcerned, yet are difficult to be deſ-
" ciphered, and do preſent to the quickeſt view, the bounty of the
" ſupream Lord, and the curſe of the Law ſet one over againſt the o-
" ther, but not the contents of the Goſpel, or mercy of a Saviour.
He muſt either ſpeak of their diſtinct preſenting or not, if of that, then how do they preſent the curſe of the Law more diſtinctly then the Goſpel? yea, or the ſupream Lord? they ſet not forth as he ſaid before his (diſtinct) name that he is the God of *Abraham*, *&c.* Nor do they ſay, how or when he gave his Law, nor mention *Sinai* more then *Sion*, nor how many Commandements he gave, more then how many Articles of the faith, nor what were the threats of the one, more then the promiſes of the other; if he meant of an obſcure preſentation, then he ſays falſely in denying that they preſent the contents of the Goſpell, or the mercy of a Saviour, for evident it is, that they preach God mercifull to ſinners, as well as juſt to puniſh ſin, and the one is the contents of the Goſpel, as much as the other is of the Law, how elſe lead they to repentance, if they witneſſe not mercy to the penitent? *Rom.* 2 4,5. How elſe ſhall he that is wiſe in obſerving them, underſtand the loving kindneſs of the Lord; *Pſal* 107. *ult?* if they the works of his providence, (for of them that *Pſalm* altogether ſpeaks) ſay nothing of his loving kindneſs which is Goſpel contents? whence elſe do poor Heathens in diſtreſſe cry to him for mercy and help, as in *Pſal* 107. and *Jon.* 1. Or offer ſacrifice in all ages, if they had not inſtruction into the propitiouſneſſe of God, as well as into his being? how came the *Ninivites* elſe though Heathen, when *Jonas* preacht nothing but judgement, to proclaim a faſt, and repent, and ſay, who knows whether God may turn again and repent, and turn away his fierce anger that we periſh not? *Jon*, 3.5, 6.9,10. *Calvin* tells us, there is an open School in the creatures, where men may learn to fear God, and *Amyrald*, thence concludes there is then a declaration of the name and goodneſſe of God too; and ſo in ſuch an obſcure manner, Gods works *bring tidings* of his goodneſſe, and *tells* and *declares* his glory, ſo *Pſal.* 19.1,2. They utter ſpeech, they praiſe the Lord, *Pſal.* 145.9,10. they be preachers of Gods name, *Pſal.* 75.1. So as it may in them be heard, and men be enduced to believe as before in *Job.* 5.8,9.13,14. with *Rom.* 10.17,18. The Apoſtle having ſaid, faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of the God, in the next *verſe* quotes the 19. *Pſalm* which

Calvin Commentar. in Pſal. 19. *Certe ſi ſchola fuit aperta in ea τῶν γεντῶν progentibus in quâ diſcerent Deum timere & ei ſervire, aperta fuit itidem ſchola in τοῖς γεντῶν in quâ Deum invocare diſcerent.*

Amyr. exer. de grat. univerſ. par. 2. p. 65.

 ſpeaks

speaks of the Heavens, Firmaments, and works of God, to prove that all had heard it, and that all too as distinct from or reaching beyond *Israel* spoken of *verse* 19. hath not *Israel* known; Yea, and that in 1 *Cor.* 1.21. That Mr. *Hacon* quotes against it, rather proves it, compared with *John* 1.4,5,6. That sayes indeed in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, (not God a Saviour says Mr. *Hacon*) that says not the wisdom of God, did not hold forth God a Saviour, but that the world by their wisdom did not there know him, now that could neither have been expected, nor they faulted for the want of it, had he not been there spoken; so that that rather implies he was there spoken, because they are taxed for not there knowing him through their wisdom, yea, and that of *John* 1. tells us the light of men was from the life in Christ; it was that the light held forth, even the light lightning or shining to every man that comes into the world, that light was in the world shining before, though the world knew him not; their darkness did not comprehend him, therefore God shewing yet more mercy raised up preachers to declare him both to *Jews*, *John* 1.6. and to *Gentiles*, 1 *Cor.* 1.21. yea, how else should wrath be desired to be powred out upon the families of the earth, that called not upon Gods name, if his name was not so preached in his works, as that it might be discerned and called upon? that something of the Gospel contents is held forth universally in the works of God, Doctor *Amyrald* learnedly proves against *Spanhemius*, let Mr. *Hacon* Answer him, as for their testimony conducing to faith *subjective*, Mr. *Hacon* hath approved what I said thereabout in passing my next Answer as a good and Orthodox one.

Joh 1.4,5, 9,10.

Jer.10.25.

Deum misericordiæ suæ philanthropia universo generi humano significationem aliquam dedit in operibus providentiæ p.71. præfat.

Sect. 8. I might note his impertinency and implyed mistake, in saying the works of providence, *present such things to the quickest view and apprehension*, as if onely to them; as if the Sun shined not the same light to the blinde as seeing: or as if the difference in mens sight made some difference in the Sun shining; what any, either Philosopher, or holy man, or Prophet, yea, or the spirit of God sees to be witnessed in the creature, and presented to men is there witnessed, and to be seen by any, had they but eyes good enough to discern it, the visibility of the Object depends not on mens actuall or potentiall seeing, but is antecedent to it, but I passe it.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

Except. 20. *About Rahab and Cornelius.*

RAhab and *Cornelius* (I said, *Queſtion* and *Anſwer* 155.) were accepted of God, in ſuch faith as they acted towards him by means of his works, ſhort of the diſtinct knowledge of Chriſt, but in my ſecond Edition, becauſe I ſee it might be queſtioned touching *Cornelius*; I left him out, and mentioned beſides *Rahab*, *Naaman*, and the *Ninivites*; againſt *Rahab* and *Cornelius*, Mr. *Hacon* Objects "that they were a pair of Proſelites, and had as "diſtinct knowledge of Chriſt, as the true Church of God than had. *Reply.* That they were Proſelites, when they firſt believed and were accepted? it cannot be proved; much leſſe that they had as diſtinct knowledge of Chriſt, as the true Church of God then had, it appears in *Joſh.* 2.9,10,11. That *Rahab* was moved and brought to her faith by the great works of God for *Iſrael*, which they had heard of before the ſpies came to her: and that ſhe either was Proſelyted to *Iſrael* before that, or by the ſpies ſhe received, before ſhe believed, the Scripture no where either ſays or ſignifies, and much leſſe, that ſhe had ſuch a diſtinct knowledge of Chriſt, as the *Jews* had, who had the Oracles of the ſeed of the woman, the ſeed of *Abraham*, of *Shiloh*, of a Prophet like *Moſes*, to be raiſed up to them, let him perſwade ſuch as will ſimply believe every word, he ſhall ſay upon his authority; he cannot prove it, no nor that *Cornelius* was a Proſelite to the *Jews*, (though there is more probability of it, that he was a Proſelite of the gate) a circumciſed Proſelite its clear he was not; and that he had not ſuch diſtinct knowledge of Chriſt, as *Peter* and the Church had, when God accepting his prayers ſent the Angel to him, for then no need of his ſending for *Peter*.

Sect. 2. "That *Rahab* and *Cornelius* had the onely means, and "that there is no variety of means to the attaining of ſaving faith, are very prooffeſſe and ſtrange aſſertions. *Rahab* had not the preaching of Chriſt diſtinctly when ſhe firſt believed; no, nor *Cornelius*

till *Peter* preachs him, had not Christ crucified preached to him. *Rahab* had not the Sacraments of the Jewish Church then, nor *Cornelius* of the Christian. And that there are variety of meanes to saving faith, let Mr. *Hac.* read over, *Rom.*2.25,26.27 and *chap.*3.1,2. ——21.22. Again, there he may finde some doing by nature, the things contained in the Law; and others believing by the Oracles, and Gospel, as preacht by the Apostles; yet we say not, "that God regards not how men come by grace, so they have it, whether by word or work; but we say, he that takes care or regard that men may have it both ways, doth accept them in that grace either ways had, *Acts* 10.34. nor have any believed, but through universal grace, as *Tit.*2.11,12. and 3.4,5. Grace saving to all men is universal grace, the meanes of manifesting it, and bringing men to beleeve it, and in God may be diverse, the grace is but one.

CHAP. XXII.

Except. 12. *To think God cruel a breach of the second Commandment.*

Doubtlesse Mr. *Hacon* was in no good temper, when he quarreld with my *Quæst.* and *Ans.*177. for saying, that to think God cruel, is a false conception, forbid in the second Commandement, and had he been as free from guilt in it, as in the other conceptions mentioned, I conceive it might have past untouched. He oppose no thing of solidity against it, but only seems to see more then is in it; and so hath somewhat of that blindnesse. *Tertullian* mentions *Apollog.* 9. of which he warnes mee *page* 114. that I aimed at such as himself, as if any word, bordering upon their principles, might not be named, taxes me with partiality, for putting four false conceptions into the same different character, or else I know not wherefore he says the second; *viz.* that God is cruel is my Adversaries, and therein says more then I said, and in saying I meant so, he steps out of his place, to judge my thoughts,

thoughts, and ſays more, then I dare affirm I thought of when I mentioned it. He ſays, the other three owne, what I charged on them and yet I charged none of them upon no body, but ſpake indefinitely and generally without reſpect to parties. He ſays, the firſt, that God is like an old man, is the Papiſts, and they willingly own what I charge them withall, when as I charged it not on them. There be many ignorant Proteſtants as guilty of it as they, I fear; yet I think he ſpeaks falſly of *Bellarmine*. For though he held it lawful to picture God *in forma hominis ſenis*, like an old man, it follows not he thought him like an old man; he held he might be pictur'd ſo, becauſe he appeard as the ancient of days, *Dan.* 7. not becauſe he thought he was like an old man, Sure he knew God to be a ſpirit, and therefore not like an old man, as *candidum* and *canum* differ, and *ſenex* and *antiquus*; ſo alſo do the holding it lawful ſo to picture God, and to judge God to be like ſuch a one. Its true, *Bellarmines* judgement was naught in that, but I think *mentiris Bellarmine*, had been better of the two, then *mentiri de Bellarmino*. He might have ſeen a great difference too, between ſaying, *no man can ſpeak too well of God*, and ſaying, *God is all mercy, ſo as he will not puniſh ſin*; they that ſpeak ſo of him, do not ſpeak well, but ill of him, as if he had pleaſure in mens wickedneſſe, or was not diſpleaſed with it: but he ſays, "oppoſite to "mercy ſtands juſtice & ſeverity, as well as cruelty, and twits me that "thoſe tearms were not fit for my turn. Here I appeal to all, whether it be fit to number amongſt falſe conceptions of God, that he is juſt or ſevere, ſeverely juſt. Cruelty he ſays is unjuſt ſeverity. Therefore ſay I fitter to bee put in as not attributable to God, then juſt ſeverity, or puniſhing men for ſin, which is not ſo much as oppoſite to mercy, becauſe they joyn in the ſame ſub ect together, and kiſſe one the other. Is this man fit to review a Catechiſme that would have me put amongſt falſe conceptions of God, that he is juſt or ſevere? I may conclude then, whatever be my Adverſaries opinion about this, that here my Adverſary had no juſt cauſe to have faulted me, but that he was led by too much odium.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIII.

Except. 22. *The behovefulneſſe of preaching and believing generall Redemption.*

WHereas in *Queſt.* and *Anſ.* 199. I aſſerted it very behovefull, that the remedy of mans miſery, be as plainly held forth in the Scriptures, as his miſerie is, that any man in crediting the Scriptures may ſee it to be provided for him, and that it is ſo uſeful both in reſpect of a mans ſelf, and his demeanours to others, that none but Sathan, and ſuch as he blinds, would perſwade men otherwiſe. "Againſt this he confeſſes the miſery of man, ſet forth to be ge-
"neral, but that the remedy is not clearly, and plainly ſet forth to be
"general and univerſal, and belonging to all men, otherwiſe then ac-
"cording to the ſenſe before ſpecified, which is ſufficient to encou-
"rage any perſon that taketh notice of it, to lay hold upon it. *Rep.* What he denies and affirms here, who can tell? 1. Doth he deny the remedy to be as plainly and clearly held forth in Scripture to be generall or univerſal, as the miſery? ſee then how falſe that is, by conſulting theſe Scriptures. *Rom.* 5, 18. as by one offence the judgement unto all men to condemnation: ſo by ones righteouſneſſe the free gift to all men to juſtification of life. 2 *Cor.* 5. 14, 15. He died for all. 1 *Tim.* 2. 6. gave himſelf a ranſome for all. *Heb.* 2. 9. taſted death by the grace of God for every one. 1 *Joh.* 2. 1, 2. is the propitiation not for our ſins only, but alſo for the ſins of the whole world. What is any where more fully, plainly, or generally ſaid of the miſery. 2. Doth he ſay it is not ſo generally held forth otherwiſe, then according to the ſenſe aforegiven. What ſenſe was that, and where given? means he in the Articles of the Church of *England*, as mentioned *pag.* 54. that the Son of God did offer a full, perfect, and ſufficient oblation and ſatisfaction for the ſins (or as my book of Articles hath it, for all the ſins) of the whole world; thats as much as I deſire, or aſſert.

3. Means

3. Means he that ſuch an univerſal holding it forth as that is is ſufficient to encourage any perſon, that taketh notice of it, to lay hold of it; thats ſuch a general holding it forth, as I affirmed behoveſull; for I ſaid it is behoveſull, it be as plainly and generally held forth, that any man in crediting the Scriptures, may ſee it provided for him, and ſays he any thing leſſe, nay, or ſays he not more? for to take notice of what is held forth, is leſſe then to credit the Scriptures; and yet he ſays its ſo held forth, as any but taking notice of it, may be encouraged to take hold of it, and thats more then to ſee it is for him. I may ſee ſomething to be for me, that yet I may want encouragement to take hold on, notwithſtanding, becauſe of ſome fears of danger to enſue thereupon; and ſo he denies, and grants again as much as he denies. or 4. Means he that ſuch a holding it forth as he mentioned, *p.* 55. and 56, *&c.* [that Chriſt hath ſufficiently indeed ſatisfied for all, but yet God will not give faith to many] he grants, and that that is ſufficient to encourage any that takes notice of it, to lay hold of it? then I deny that laſt clauſe, if one of thoſe to whom God gives not faith, take great notice of that doctrine, will that encourage him ſufficiently to take hold of the remedy? then he may take hold of it without faith, or have faith without Gods gift, or can no man take notice of a doctrine, but he that believes it? thats falſe, for I take notice of many that I believe not, and ſo hath Mr. *Hacon* too. *I* might ask him here if faith may be wrought without illumination and perſwaſion of the holy Ghoſt, that the declaration of the truth, as he holds it, being but taken notice of, is ſufficient to encourage to take hold of Chriſt the remedy? or whether illumination and perſwaſion at the moſt, ſuffice not to make a man take notice of the propoſitions of truth, by which he may be ſufficiently encouraged to believe, or what is wanting to a man ſufficiently encouraged, that he may ay hold of that to which he is ſo encouraged, as alſo whether he be the juſt meaſure of the truth in that point, that his holding of it, is the exact ſtandard to which others are to be conformed; but *I* paſſe them things.

Sect. 2. He ſays *Rom.* 3. doth in divers verſes teſtifie mans loſſe, "and ſinfulneſſe to be univerſal, and over all. But the remedy by "Chriſts righteouſneſſe, in reſpect of actual efficacy, is reſtrained verſ. "22. to them that believe, which reſtriction is very often expreſſed, "and muſt be underſtood in thoſe places, where it is not expreſſed,

"and

"and where the univerſal particle *All*, is barely and ſolely laid down. *Rep.* 1. If the remedy by Chriſts righteouſneſſe be ſo reſtrained as to its actual efficacie, how ſaid he before, *p.* 100. that Chriſts mediation is actually efficacious for all men in the world? is not that the remedy by his righteouſneſſe? 2. If he mean it only of efficacie upon men to juſtifie and ſave them, then he prevaricates from the buſineſſe, which was not that the remedy be declared to be efficacious upon all, but only provided for all, that any in receiving of it might prove its efficacie. 3. And that he might have found there in that verſe, and in the following, as generally declared as the miſery; for *ver.* 22. ſays, the righteouſneſſe of God is to or for all, (εἰς πάντα) as well as upon all that beleeve; and *ver.* 23. having ſaid, All have ſinned and come ſhort of the glory of God; it follows, *verſe* 24. and are juſtified, or being juſtified (δικαιούμενοι, which can agree to nothing there but πάντες *all*, freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jeſus Chriſt, juſtified namely in ſuch a ſenſe as in *Rom.* 5. 18. releaſed and diſcharged in Chriſt from that ſentence of condemnation and obligation, to bear the judgement upon themſelves, which was upon them, and they muſt have periſhed in, had not Chriſt ſtood in their place. The like in 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. not imputing their treſpaſſes to them. 4. He dictates notably, as if he was to be called Maſter of the Faith, in telling us without proof, that that reſtriction muſt be underſtood in thoſe places where it is not expreſſed; and where the univerſal particle *All*, is barely and ſolely laid down. How knows he that Chriſts mediation is actually efficacious for all the men in the world; if never an *All* barely laid down in the Scripture, be free from ſuch a reſtriction as he impoſeth?

Sect. 3. He faults my Anſwer again, "As hurtful to the younger "ſort, as no way apt to teach them, either the fear of God, or re- "verence to man: not the fear of God, becauſe (he ſays) it carries "with it ſo much arrogance toward him, as to ſet down and pre- "ſcribe what it behoved him to have done, though it doth not ap- "pear he hath done it. *Rep.* 1. That laſt clauſe is falſe, for it doth appear clearly enough to all that have eyes to ſee, that God hath ſo plainly and generally expreſt it. as I ſaid, the Scriptures above quoted prove it; yea, he himſelf ſaid, *page* 53. "that there be many "Scriptures and Arguments inſoluble brought to prove it, that

"Chriſt

"Chriſt died for all: And *p.* 58. that it is impoſſible for me to lay "hold on Chriſt, unleſſe he be ordained and appointed a Saviour "for me; and this cannot be but by Gods Appointment and Inſti-"tution, ſetting him forth to be a *Common Sacrifice* and Propitiation. Therefore 2. It was no *arrogance* towards God in the leaſt to ſay, that what he hath done, and what is of ſuch behooſulneſſe or neceſſity, to my laying hold on Chriſt, as that it is no way feaſible for me without it, was behooful for us to be done, no more then it was arrogance in the Apoſtle, to ſay it was behooful we have ſuch a Captain and High Prieſt as Chriſt is, *Heb.* 2.10. and 7.26, 3. Nor ſaid I what it behoved God to have done; but that what he hath done is behooful for us, for our beleeving. He addes, "nor the reverence "of man, becauſe it carries with it towards him ſo much virulence, "as to judge all thoſe to be led blindfold by the Devil, that are not perſwaded God hath done what is here thought behooful "to be done, though it be plain and certain he hath not done it. *Rep.* 1. This laſt clauſe again is a plain and certain falſhood, contradictory to the Scriptures above quoted, and to his own expreſſions. 2. That alſo is a ſlander, therefore that my Anſwer leads any to judge all thoſe to be led blindfold by the Devill, that are not perſwaded, God hath done what he hath not done; nay, I ſaid not ſo much as all that are not perſwaded of what God hath done, but only that perſwade men otherwiſe [then God hath declared.] And 3. what virulency is in that toward any man? Who but Satan would ſo blind any man as to lead him to perſwade men otherwiſe then is behooful for him, and then as God hath declared in the Scriptures? Was it virulency in the Apoſtle to ſay that *Satan had blinded the mindes of them that beleeve not*, 2 *Cor.* 4.3,4. Ontaught he them *Corinths* he writ to, to vent their malice toward ſuch men, as he ſays, I teach the children, p 5. Verily no, much leſſe is it virulency to ſay they be blinded of him that perſwade others not to beleeve Gods ſayings.

Sect. 4. "That I deliver up multitudes of Churches to Satan "for their Teacher, becauſe they refuſe to follow me who profeſs "to leave the road in which their guides and worthies have gone "before them,] is a virulent ſlander. For, 1. I endeavour to reſcue men from Satans being their Teacher, not to deliver up any to him, much leſſe whole Churches. 2. Its a ſlander againſt whole Churches, if they be Churches of Chriſt, to imply that they per-

 ſwade

ſwade men otherwiſe, then that the remedy is provided for all men, and ſo that they teach otherwiſe then Chriſt hath taught, and take others for their guides and worthies then his Apoſtles, and ſuch as bring his Doctrine. Particularly its falſe of the Church of *England*, who teaches that Chriſt redeemed all mankind, and hath offered up a full perfect and ſufficient oblation, and ſatisfaction, for all the ſins of the whole world; and therefore perſwades not men otherwiſe, then that the remedy was provided for all; And I hope Mr *Hacon* will not queſtion, but they who perſwade any to beleeve otherwiſe then the Church of *England* hath declared herein, are blinded by *Satan*; and not Gods Churches in that thing. I hope as the *Phariſees* were not the Church of *Iſrael*, though in it; ſo the denyers of general Redemption are not the Church of *England* though in it. 3. More palpably falſe it is, that I do as he ſaith, becauſe they refuſe to follow me. As alſo 4. That I profeſſe to leave that road in which the Churches guides and worthies have gone before me; for it appears that was the Scripture-road, and in that I walk, and never profeſſed yet to leave that.

Sect. 5. That thoſe whoſe minds the *god of this world hath blinded their eyes*, 2 *Cor.* 4. 4. were not ſo much beloved of God as others were, to whom the Apoſtle preached with better ſucceſſe, though they had the ſame choice means of ſalvation, that they had; neither was there ſo much good will toward them as to others, whoſe eyes and hearts the Lord did open, that they might ſee and beleeve, and affect what was taught, and be ſaved; much leſſe was there ſo much good will towards thoſe that were never ſo much as outwardly called; may be granted without contradiction to any thing I have ſaid: For who can think that I ſay, God loves unbeleevers ſo much as thoſe that beleeve, or as the fearers of the Lord (ſuch as *Lydia* was before ſhe heard *Paul*, and therein had *her heart opened to attend him*)? Or that God extends ſuch love and favour to the Heathens and Pagans as to us? Nor was it the not beleeving that God loves all men alike, or the perſwading men otherwiſe, that I attributed to Satans blinding men, as he both here, and in *p.* 5. falſly ſuggeſts, but their perſwading men, that God hath not loved ſome at all; or that Chriſt died not for all. He might have ſeen in my Eſſays, had not ſomething blinded him: That I declared the quite contrary to what he thence charges upon me, *Viz.* I declared

Acts 16. 4.

Eſſays p. 17, & 20

red there, that God may deal unlike with like perſons in diſpenſations of grace to them; ſurely this man was guilty of the blindneſs he warns me of, that is, of ſeeing more then is to be ſeen, becauſe he ſaw not what is to be ſeen. I wiſh him to take our Saviours counſel, *Matth.* 7.5. Caſt out the beam of prejudice, that leads him to ſlander his neighbour, and annoint his eyes with eye-ſalve, that he may ſee clearly, as *Rev.* 3.18. then may he ſee himſelf to be rather blind, then them that can diſcern grace to be of the ſame extent or larger (though not in the world, as he miſ-phraſes it, yet) in God toward the world that ſin is of, and that the ſalve provided for mankind is full-out as broad as the ſore, and ſomewhat broader, had he looked upon the Goſpel with Goſpel eyes, he might find that aſſerted *Rom.* 5. 12. to the end: Or if that like him not, let him ſtudy better the meaning of a *full, perfect,* and *ſufficient* ſatisfaction, for all the ſins of the whole world.

Articles of the Church of *England*, Artic. 31.

CHAP. XXIV.

Exception 23. *Why generall Redemption is a behooſull doctrine.*

DIvers reaſons I gave why it behooved us, to have the remedy plainly and generally ſet forth, *Anſwer* 200. 201. as the good ground it affords to men, to repent, bleſſe God, &c. And to love, pray for, and help other men, &c. againſt which he ſayes in generall. 1. That it becomes us not to ſay, what behooved God, that "*tenetur, decet, debuit,* &c. which is ſpoke to above; I onely adde, That its ingratitude in man, not to take notice of, and be thankfull for the behooſulneſſe of Gods ſayings and doings for us, as *Heb.* 7.26. 2. Not every thing (he ſayes) muſt be "taught whether true or falſe, becauſe ſome good may likely come of it if believed, &c. *Reply.* True, but what is true and good too, ought to be taught, yea, though it occaſion hatred, and reproach, from the unbelieving and froward; his inſtance of the doctrine of

merit, is not like this; for, 1. That is not asserted in Scriptures as this is. 2. Nor is it so great an incouragement to good works as reward of grace, which is more certain and boundlesse then merit can be, and breeds no such ill proud humors as that doth, but the necessity of holding forth a Common sacrifice, he himself asserts, *p.* 58. he should therefore have taken his caution to himself, to "beware of digging up the foundation, and tampering "with the ground work of free grace, that God hath laid in the Scripture, and of bearing false witnesse both against God and his neighbour, against God in saying, he hath not done and declared what it is evident he hath, and against his neighbour in saying, I declared what its evident I never did, *viz.* That God loves one man as much as another. *i. e.* every man alike.

Sect. 2. In his 3d. he more particularly says, "my adversaries "that hold universall redemption, though not every way as I do; "do repent, blesse God, think well of him and love others, *&c.* "By vertue of that doctrine which they have learned, touch-"ing Gods love and Christs death. *Reply.* Its well if it be so; But 1. How doth this oppose my Reasons? for if they hold universal Redemption, and do those things by vertue thereof, that is, rather an evidence of the behoofulness of believing, and holding it, then the contrary; it was not the love of me, or holding it just as I do in every punctilio, that I said was so behooful. 2. How doth it appear that such holders of it as Mr. *Bacon*, do these things? and particularly that they love others, as that doctrine instructs, seeing they are my Adversaries for holding it, because I hold it not in all things as they do? Is enmity to a man because he is not of their mind a sign of love? For he says not, they be my dissenting brethren, but my adversaries: God grant their other frames be righter; for *not he that commends himself*, &c.

Sect. 3. Lastly, he suggests that "the people taught to reason "after this manner, may be indangered to forget the charge of "*Moses*, Deut. 29. so far as contrary to it, to be careless in doing "duties commanded, and conforming to Gods revealed will be-"cause made no further acquainted with his secret intention, and "to stand and capitulate and be upon points of certainty with God, *&c.* *Reply.* All this is groundlesse, for. 1. I did not teach them to reason but believe what is revealed, and to reason and act

as that leads and requires them. 2. I teach them to act revealed duties from revealed truths, and to believe Gods heart to be according to his words in his Goſpel declaration, and not to look after his ſecrets, or capitulate with him, but to believe and declare his love revealed, and do as that teacheth, *Tit.* 2.11,12. as knowing they are indebted to him for it, and in danger of his wrath, if they believe it not or diſobey him. 3. He ſaid himſelf, p. 57. *Whoſoever believeth in the Son of God muſt believe this at leaſt that he dyed for him,* is not that the ſame ſecret and certainty he here faults mens looking after?

CHAP. XXV.

Except. 24. *Of the way of knowing the remedy to be for us.*

IN *Anſwer* 202. I preferred the crediting the general declaration of Gods gift of Chriſt, for men and his death for all above any other way of gueſſing it, or grounding their faith of it, upon any acts of their believing, wel walking, &c. as antecedent to their knowing that the remedy is for the mand that for three reaſons. 1. The greater certainty of Gods word then the acts of a mans deceitful heart, or any other pretended revelation, *viz.* Then that of and by the word. 2. Becauſe ſuch faith or acts of it that are before the knowledge or perception of Gods love towards us; cannot evidence Election to which thoſe that oppoſe generall redemption confine it. 3. Becauſe thoſe other ways endanger mens being Pharaſees to truſt in themſelves; that they be righteous and deſpiſe others, the thing pleaded for in all, which being the ſame in effect with what himſelf ſays, in p. 57. before quoted, and " that God commands every man that hears the " Goſpel to believe that the Son of God dyed for him, and that is " not true becauſe I believe it (ſee, this rejects that believing it to be true upon the account of my believing which I rejected) but it " muſt firſt be true (and ſo apprehended too I trow) before it be

be beleeved; and therefore surely say I, not rendred beleeveable by my beleeving it, and with what he says, *p.* 58. 'That I cannot 'beleeve in him as appointed a Saviour for me, but by Gods appointment, setting him forth a common Sacrifice and propitiation; which with that before quoted, *p.* 57. amounts to this, That I cannot beleeve in Christ, before I by Gods setting him forth a common Sacrifice, beleeve he died for me, this must go before that, therefore that must not be the way to this: Yea, in *page* 117. (even now spoken to) he says, the good frames, repentance, faith, love of my adversaries, and their duties they doe, by vertue of what they have learned touching God's love, and Christs death, and if so, then sure they learned not Gods love and Christs death, by vertue of their faith, repentance, and good duties, which is the very thing I spake in substance.

Sect. 2. In this whole Exception then he prevaricates from *p.* 118. to 136. in laying that as the foundation of all the rest; 'that I make a mans being assured that the remedy hath *taken* 'place on him, so as he is *releeved* and *cured* by it, hath obtained 'peace, pardon, &c. *all one* with the being *informed* that the reme-'dy is provided for him, that he may *seek* to injoy and attain it: Which is very false, for I spake only about this latter, not at all of 'that former, and so not against a Christians knowing assuredly 'by faith obedience (though I would rather say in beleeving and o-'beying) and by the testimony of the Spirit, that the remedy of 'Christs death, and benefits of his passion are his own, and *efficaciously applied to him* for the raising him to spiritual life, &c. and therefore he fights here with his own fictions, in all this Exception; and I might passe it, could I forbear to shew him many other pittiful mistakes that he is guilty of therein; divers falshoods and gross mistakes, As;

Sect. 3. 1. 'That I deny works, or graces, or faith either (unlesse 'of my own mark and allowance) to confer any thing to the con-'solation of a Christian, because I said in Preface to my *Open Door*: That the dawbings of those that tell souls they may know that Christ loves them by their good desires, strifes, and labours, my soul abhorrs; for though the way to know, or (I would rather say) the evidence of the love of Christ is the Gospel, or the gift and death of Christ, as therein declared, as *John* 3.16, 17. 1 *John* 3.16.

and

and 4.9,10. yet the beleef of the Goſpel, and of that love; yea, and the deſirings after that word, and labouring for that bread of life, conduce much to a Chriſtians comfort, in as much as they are the way, and means of attaining to the perception of that great evidence of the love of God to ſinners; yea, and the effects of that faith, which cloſeth with the appearance of Gods love, are not without their attending comfort as thoſe Scriptures, 2 *Cor.* 1. 12. 2 *Pet.* 1.5.-10. and 1 *John* 3.14. quoted by him, ſo alſo *Gal.* 6. 7, 8, 9, 10. *Matth.* 5. and many others prove, to *conduce to a Chriſtians comfort*, and to be *Mediums*, *evidencing Chriſts love to a doubting or ſinſick ſoul*, are greatly different, and therefore badly confounded.

2. 'That the Apoſtle argues from our ſanctification to our juſtification in 2 *Cor.* 5.17. *If any man be in Chriſt, he is a new creature*, is a miſtake: to be a new creature there, is to be in a new ſtate and condition a Son of God, and ſo old things are paſſed away, and all things become new; but all things are not yet become new in ſanctification or inherent holineſs, as that they call ſanctification; in that reſpect the new man is yet to be daily put on, and the old to be put off, *Eph.* 4. 21, 22. 'That the merciful, meek, pure in heart are the ſubjects of Gods bleſſing is no doubt, but that thoſe things are the *Mediums* of diſcerning Gods love to be towards us, or Chriſt to have died for us, and not the effects of his love perceived, and beleeved will be denied him; *Paul* had not thoſe frames till after the love and pitty of God to man appeared, *Tit.* 3. 4, 5. which Scripture he miſtakes too, to ſpeak of juſtification, *p.* 131. when the ſaving a man from his folly, diſobedience, ſervice of divers luſts there ſpoken of, is not juſtification, but renovation or ſanctification. Thoſe quotations from 2 *Cor* 1. 12. 2 *Pet.* 1. make no more againſt what I ſaid, then *Rom.* 8. 16. and 1 *Cor.* 2. 12. make for other pretended revelations of Chriſts having died for a man, then what are afforded in and by the Word of God.

3. His diſcourſe of 'another mans knowing the truth of a mans faith by his works, as life by breath, *p.* 121, 122. is wholly impertinent; ſurely they that know not that Chriſt mediates for them, but by and from their works, ground their Faith of it upon their works; and ſo doth he that judges another man to live, by perceiving him to breathe, ground his beleef of that mans being alive upon his breathing, though he ground not his life upon it: And

ſo

ſo it is, if a man know not that he himſelf lives, but by his breathing, which had been more to the purpoſe; his miſtake therein then is too ridiculous, and as impertinent is his diſcourſe about mens knowing their converſion, and the time of it, though I think it behooves every man that loves his ſoul to be more conſiderative of the manner and means of it, then Mr. *Hacon* judges needful, leſt he reſt in a conceit of it, in ſtead of a reall and right converſion unto God: What he writes about ſome broken pieces of my ſayings, about ſecret operations, and inſenſible workings of the Spirit is alike impertinent too; for its one thing for the Spirit inſenſibly to work, which I denied not, and another thing to make that which men but conjecture ſo (as workings ſo conceived without, and otherwiſe then by the word) with the Phariſee, *Luke* 18. the ground of their beleeving that Chriſt died for them, or that they are righteous; and that was it I ſpake againſt; will Mr. *Hacon* turn Enthuſiaſt in ſtead of proving me one?

4. He groſly falſifies my caveat, as if I ſaid therein that I miſlike mens gathering comfort or aſſurance from ſenſible feelings, viſits, &c. For there is no ſuch word as gathering comfort or aſſurance in all that place he quotes. It is mens *living* upon ſenſible feelings, or viſits, as *Iſrael* upon ſight of Gods preſence and wonders, and not upon Gods word mixed in the heart with faith as *Abraham* did; that I there faulted as occaſioning many mens falling away in a time of temptation when their ſenſes are not ſo ſatisfied, as *Hebr.* 6. 4. *Luke* 8. 13. and that ſuch perſons are called *ſenſual. Jude* 19. compared with 5. proves, ſuch as are like *Iſrael*, who beleeved when they ſaw; but wanting the Spirit of faith, when ſuch ſenſible demonſtrations were withdrawn, murmured and complained, and withdrew from God: Now what affinity hath this living upon ſenſual feelings after that manner, with being viſited with Gods conſolations, and being ſenſible of heavenly light and joy, as *Pſal.* 94. Or with joy in beleeving, as 1 *Pet.* 1. 6. to have theſe things in beleeving, and to live upon them as the ground of their beleeving, I trow differ much; and ſo he hath groſly abuſed me, in ſuggeſting that I called ſuch Chriſtians as have joy in beleeving, ſenſual; which word ſenſual differs as much from ſenſitive as ſenſible; and they that interpret that word ſenſual ψυχικοὶ, to be thoſe that intend only, and are led by their ſenſitive part, or carnal

appe-

appetite or nature, common to us with beasts, as Mr. Hacon saies, Mr. *Beza* tells us, in 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. are the Sophisters.

Sect. 4. He hath also divers odious and false insinuations, p. 125, 126. from my calling the heart deceitful, and quoting in the Margin *Prov.* 28. 26. *Jer.* 17. 9. 1. 'As if I suggested that every mans heart is at all times in every thing deceived] do not deceitful and deceived differ as much as *senex* and *antiquus?* much more deceitful and alwaies actually deceived? 2. As if I did 'rend the Scriptures, 'to tear a Text out of the Bible, though against reason, against the 'analogy of faith, and quite contrary to other places. *Rep.* The Analogy of Faith, I conceive, is rather that proportion of the faith every man hath, which the Apostle would have none to exceed in his prophecying, rather then any Systeme to be subscribed by all, whether they see so far or not, but that by the by. What Scripture did I crosse in calling the heart deceitful? Or saying this act are not so evident and sure a foundation of beleeving a thing, as the Word of God? He mentions that 1 *John* 3. 20. *If our heart condemn us, God is greater then our heart, and knows all things.* 'If our heart 'condemn us not (says Mr. *Hacon*) it is so good a sign, that we may have confidence toward God; pitiful yet: It is some mens misery, that they think they see, and cannot endure to entertain a thought to the contrary, when as the only way to see indeed, is to see that they see not; till when their sin of opposition to what should cure them remaineth; *John* 9. 40, 41. *Sed quis dabit hoc?* Or *quis credet?* If God be greater then our hearts and knows all things, then its better and surer to trust Gods word, then our hearts, which not knowing all things, may in many things deceive us, as *Peters* did him; therefore *Paul* says, *Though he knew nothing by himself, yet was he not therefore justified, he that judgeth me is the Lord,* &c. 1 Cor. 4. 4, 5. Again, the Apostle says not, If our hearts condemn us not, that is so good a sign that we may have confidence: I would men see the rottenness of such mis-sayings; for then *Pauls* heart when a persecutor, not condemning him for it, it was a good sign that he might have confidence towards God; the Apostle says not, then may we, much less thence may we have confidence; but then have we confidence, or *loquendi libertatem*, freedome to speak to God; the confidence springs from the grace of God known and beleeved towards us, which then is clearly and without stop beheld by the

beleever of it, when he hath not turned aside to crooked ways, and contracted guilt to clog his conscience, or stand between him and his God. 3. As if I had said or implied, 'That a faithful Christi-'an may not judge aright of his own condition; no such thing was either thought or said. 4. As if this was the rule I laid down, that mans heart is deceitful, and no sure foundation of beleeving a thing (which saying, though I judge true enough, yet) my saying it was not so; but that the acts of a mans deceitful heart are nothing so evident and sure a foundation of beleeving a thing, as the Word of God is. He says the foresaid rule, as falsly mentioned by him, 'is a sure foundation or principle of Scepticism or beleeving no-'thing at all, and not many removes distant from Atheism; let us see him as good at proving as charging: He says, 'With the heart man beleeves; well said, but is with the heart all one, as upon the account of the heart man beleeves; *with* signifies not the foundation, but the instrument, part, or instrumental agent: I beleeve Gods Word with the heart; is that all one, as I beleeve my heart? Or I beleeve because my heart beleeves. He adds, 'And if the heart 'be deceitful in every thing how can he beleeve any thing] Its a pittiful thing to be blind with prejudice, for that in *every thing* was not mine, but his own addition; if his man cheat him but once a week, will he not call him a deceitful fellow, because all the week else he is honest to him? Again, may not the veriest cheat in the world beleeve something himself, because he is to be believed in nothing by any body else? What should hinder him? He says, 'I do 'not well to make opposition between a beleeving mans heart, and Gods Word. *Rep.* I made not any opposition between them, but only a comparison, yet the believer finds too much opposition there to Gods Word I fear: 'The man that makes not his own heart, but Gods Word his foundation, is not the man I spake of, but the contrary; but yet such as gather God loves them from their sanctifying graces as they judge them, and have no other knowledge but that of it; make not Gods Word their foundation of beleeving it, but their hearts verdict of their graces, and the heart may therein deceive them, as the Pharisees did him, *Luke* 11. Yea, *Peter's* deceived him too, about the measure or strength of his beleeving, and loving: He *that believes his own heart is a fool*, then whosoever he be, *Prov.* 28.26.

Sect. 5.

Sect. 5. Againſt my ſecond reaſon he lays this notorious abuſive ſlander for a foundation, *viz.* that the meaning of it is, that "He "that beleeves that God loves all alike, and Chriſt died alike for all "men, as to the intention of benefit by his Death, hath a right faith, "even before any grace of Sanctification wrought: but he that "believeth that the benefit of Chriſts death, who died for all, is "more intended to ſome then others, hath no true faith, nor ſigne "of Gods Election, though his faith be accompanied with obedience, "good deſires, and changes, and a pretended teſtimony of the Spi-"rit; which he calls (as he may well) an aſſertion, he knows not whe-"ther more boldly or more blindly uttered. And upon this foun-dation he builds a charge of me, with uncharitableneſſe to my Ad-verſaries, and uncomfortableneſſe to my own party. But his foun-dation is ſandie, and therefore what he builds muſt needs fall: his charging me with ſuch an aſſertion, was guilty I am ſure of blind-neſſe, or malice, or both: For I never ſaid, either 1. That God loves all alike. Or 2. That Chriſt died alike for all men, as to the in-tention of the benefit of his death. Or 3. That he that believes ſo, hath a right faith, before any grace of Sanctification wrought, though we being ſanctified by faith; faith is before Sanctification where they are indeed, and not the graces of Sanctification before faith. Nor 4. That he who believeth, as in the latter part of his ſaying is expreſ-ſed, hath no true faith, ſuch a mans faith may be falſe; and it may be true, as the ground and conſequents of it are right or wrong. This man then practiſes the Machiavilian maxime, *calumniari audaciter*, yet *nihil hæret*. I ſaid, the faith of *Gods* Elect ſprings from the ap-pearance of *Gods* love, as declared in the *Goſpel*, and cloſeth with it as its object; and not from ſome acts of the heart or life, before any ſuch appearance of his love, from which acts his love is gueſſed or gathered. He that cannot ſubſcribe to that, had need to queſti-on his believing. Now his beginning being ſo bad, what can be ex-pected from it? the root of thoſe his charges of uncharitableneſſe and uncomfortableneſſe, being rottenneſſe, thoſe charges can be nothing but as the apples of *Sodom*, duſt and ſmoke, (to retort his own expreſſion) uncharitable ſlanders of the like ſtamp, with what they ſpring from.

Sect. 6. What he ſayes of the Phariſees, ſaying with reference to my third reaſon, is all impertinent too; for it was not his ſaying, but

his doing, in trusting in himself that he was righteous, and thence despising others, and being ready to persecute them that discovered the right foundation, and way of beleeving, and regeneration, that I blamed. And they that so do are truly Pharisees in condition, but he beats much upon that falshood. "That I teach an equal (that is, "an alike) dispensation of grace to all, and that as much good was "intended to every man, as to him that can with a true belief say, "the Son of God loved me, and gave himself for me, &c. *p.* 129. and 133. which is a meer slander; for he can no where finde in any of my writings any such sayings. He fastens it upon my Essayes, *p.* 18. but falsely, the contrary being in *p.* 17. and 20. granted. Besides, a nest of falshoods he addes about what he thence quotes. As,

1. That I gave many Reasons, why of two men every way alike, going to the same Sermon, one should be converted, the other not, whereas I gave but two in all of it, if such a thing might be supposed, and one of them was, that God, though equal in all his dispensations (as equal signifies in *Ezek.* 18. that is, just) may distribute his grace unlikely to like persons if he please. 2. That I gave this as one reason of it, because one may be more outwardly vitious then another, and having lesse conceit of his goodnesse, may sooner receive instruction then another, that is, civilly and religiously inclined, as the Publicans before the Pharisees. Whereas on the contrary I gave this as a reason, why it might be doubted, whether ever there were two men so alike in all things, going to the same Sermon, that of unconverted persons there be many differences, and many things, that may render two natural men alike, as to their disposition towards the grace of God, &c. And I gave that for one, that there is difference in mens conceits of themselves, and there is more hope of a fool then of a man wise in his own eyes. And that I said, might be a reason why men more outwardly vitious, may sooner receive instruction then others civilly or religiously inclined: as in the instance of the Publicans. 3. That it is an errour to say, that men outwardly vitious, being lesse conceited of their goodnesse, may sooner receive instructions then others, civilly or religiously inclined, having namely conceits of their own goodnesse, wisdome, &c. that it is no errour my instance proved. And so doth *Luk.* 18. 10, 11, 12. of the Pharisee and Publican. Against my instance he excepts:

cepts: But in that Exception. 4. He hath this intimate falſhood, that I ſhould ſay or ſignifie, that the Scribes and Phariſees were not vitious. Whereas I inſtanced them, as not ſo outwardly vitious only as the Publicans, and as perſons religiouſly inclined; and that they were religiouſly inclined (though not inclined to the truth of religion) notwithſtanding their oſtentation and hypocriſie, is evident in this, that they were more then inclined, for they were of the ſtraiteſt Sect of Religion amongſt the Jews, if *Paul* may be beleeved, who himſelf was one of them, *Acts* 26.5. zealous for, and blameleſſe according to the righteouſneſſe of the Law, ſome of them, as in *Rom.* 10.2. *Phil.* 3.4,5,6.

Sect. 7. He ſays, "that of truſting in themſelves, recoyles upon "our party, who he ſays, had a minde to truſt themſelves rather then "another. How doth that appear? is it becauſe they believe Gods ſayings rather then their own Reaſon, or other mens. "They will "have no decrees, he ſays, concerning mens eſtates, but revo- "cable, and they plead againſt free-grace, and for free-will, and like "better of a general ſufficient grace, then of any ſpecial and effica- "cious grace. Theſe are his ſayings, and but bare ſayings without proof, and a bare denial may ſerve them.

1. I ſay, God may and often doth reverſe his decrees, purpoſes, or judgements, as appears in 1 *Sam*, 2. 30. *Jer.* 18.7,8,9,10,11. *Jon.* 3. *Zeph.* 3.1,2. yet I beleeve there be irrevocable decrees concerning mens eſtates too, as *Luc.* 14.24. ſuch is too, that they who beleeve ſhall be ſaved, the unbeliever ſhall periſh, &c

2. To the ſecond, I ſay, that God by his grace frees the will, and requires man to uſe its freedome, in receiving and ſerving his free grace, accepts them that ſo do, and condemns them that uſe it otherwiſe, or accept not the freedom offered and brought to them; but that this or any thing elſe we ſay is againſt free grace, is odiouſly ſpoken.

3. To the third I ſay, that Gods grace is general and ſufficient, and efficacious too in all that receive it, *Tit.* 2.11,12. nor need we any other grace then that, and what that leads the receiver too, which is more ſpecial and effectual then the refuſers of it, and ſo then all men do enjoy.

Sect. 8. He urges that further, by imputing to ſome of this party, the rendring that a cable-rope that we reade a Camel. *Rep.* But thats not of all of our party, nor to the purpoſe againſt any: ſeeing we all

all acknowledge that to be impoſſible to men, and only poſſible by his grace that is there aſſerted, *viz.* the entring of a rich man into Gods Kingdom. *Further*, [" That we truſt in our ſelves that we " can be righteous when we will] if he means, when our wills by grace are ſet to ſeek righteouſneſſe in Chriſt, we may own it, ſeeing every one that ſo ſeeks findes, otherwiſe its a meer ſlander: "That " wicked men are taught by us to believe, that God would never " be ſo unreaſonable as to command any thing that is impoſſible. *Rep.* Mr. *Hac.* teaches *p.*58. that God doth not command any thing that is impoſſible, impoſſible in it ſelf to be done. As for me to beleeve in, or lay hold of Chriſt a Saviour, unleſſe he be ordained a Saviour for me, or to be nouriſhed by a ſtone, and is it not impoſſible in it ſelf for a man to work with his hands bound, and to go with his feet in the ſtocks, or to repent and believe, if God never ordained faith and repentance for him, nor gives them to him? He addes, that we teach, ſo long as God calls men, they have power to come. *Ref.* That they have it of themſelves we ſay not, that while it is a day of ſalvation, an accepted time, his calls bring and give ſuch power to men, that his grace may be received effectually by men, becauſe God is nigh to help them; we think the Apoſtle ſays, 2 *Cor.*6.1,2. and therefore we ſay ſo too: But we ſay withal, that its not in mans power to retaine the Spirit. *Eccleſ.* 8. 8. either his own to live, or Gods, to believe, and live well as he pleaſes; But God may take away both the one and the other, as he pleaſes. The Key is in Chriſts hand, and he may riſe up and ſhut to the door, and lock men out when he ſees fit, and therefore our Doctrine gives no incouragement to any 'to defer their repentance, and to think they may leave their ſins, and be converted, &c. at their leaſure, at fur-'theſt, when they die, that ſo they may be elected to eternall life: 'and that thats the only time of peremptory election. Theſe be meer falſhoods, and malicious ſlanders, which our Adverſaries (as he truly calls them) ought not to preſſe our Doctrine with. In the mean time, I would know of him, whether they of his party do not teach, that God commands all men to repent and believe? and whether that be not as impoſſible as for a Camel to go through a Needles eye, (or more, for God can make this poſſible) to thoſe to whom he never ordained to give faith and repentance? And how any man can defer his repentance, ſeeing, if he be elect, (according

to

to their principles) he hath repentance so given him, as he cannot defer it a minute longer then to that time, and before which, it is impossible to repent. And if not elected, they never have power at any time to performe it, it being never given him: Let him consider if these things can be so well wiped off from, or answered by his Doctrine, as I have wiped off his false imputations.

CHAP. XXVI.

Exception 25. *About the manner of Gods working Faith.*

Sect. 1. BY the cooperation of the holy Ghost inlightening mindes, and perswading their hearts to embrace the truth, and goodness of God presented to them in the Gospel heard, &c. I said, God works, increases, and preserves faith in men. Against this, in his story of the Remonstrants, he confounds *suadendo* with *persuadendo*, counselling with perswading, which *Camero*, and *Augustin* would have taught him to distinguish. *Austin* says, *non omnibus persuadetur, quibus suadetur venire ad Christum*, &c. All are not perswaded who are counselled. And *Camero* saies, Morall suasion in the Synods of Dorts sense, is but *forinsecus insonans doctrina*, a doctrine sounding in from without. But perswasion he saies, is *potentissima, valentissima, efficacissima, quâ voluntas inclinatur, flectitur, ducitur, rapitur denique.* A most powerfull action, most prevalent and effectuall, inclining, bending, leading, and carrying on the will; Of which Mr. *Hacons* account is far short, who saies, 'Its but as the bringing light into the Prison, and telling the Prisoner, its better to be abroad at his liberty, then to ly 'there. Which falls short of what I said, for in saying the holy Ghost works by perswasion, I said not, that he by perswasion works nothing. *Defens. Camer. p. 55.*

Sect.

Sect. 2. He taxes me with rendring *Eph.*5.6. children of unperſwaſibleneſs, and ſaies, 'If wicked men be unperſwaſible, then 'perſwaſion will not do it alone, there muſt be that, and ſomewhat 'more. *Reply*, True, and ſo I ſaid too, there muſt be illumination, and operation on Gods part; and in men beholding, *Iſa.*65.1. and 45.22. and hearing. *Iſa.*55.2,3. Now the wicked are like the deaf Adder, that ſtops his eare, and will not hear,&c. *Pſal.*58.4. and thats it God charges upon them, and implies, had that been but afforded, all had been done, *Pſal.*81.11—14,15. By the power accompanying, the voice heard. So *John* 5.25. but for want of that, they are unperſwaſible, which is bad enough, though by reaſon of that they are filled with all other bads too. Now the Argument follows not, perſwaſion doth it not to them that hear not, therefore, neither will it do to them that hear. A plaiſter only will not heal him that rejects it, therefore, neither will it heal him that applies it. Perſwaſion doth it with the perſwaſible; as *Ainſworth* reads that, *Gen.*9.27. God will perſwade the perſwaſible, the incliner of the ear; Which word there uſed, *Ainſworth* alſo tels us, is often uſed for drawing men to Chriſt, the ſpecial work, as he ſays, of God. So its uſed in *Acts* 17.4. and 18.4. and 28.23,24. The Patriarks faith was wrought by illumination, and perſwaſion. *Heb.*11.13. being inlightned, they ſee the promiſes, and being perſwaded, they embraced them.

Sect. 3. But how then doth God work faith, ſaith Mr. *Hacon?* 'by compulſion? No, (*Religio non cogenda*, ſaies *Tertullian*). 'but by giving a new Spirit, and frame of heart, to incline, and bend the 'will to God. *Reply*, I thought the new Spirit and heart, had followed faith, and that the heart had been made good by it, rather then to it. So *Acts* 15.9. purifyed their hearts by faith. And 26.18. Sanctyfied by faith that is in me. Mr. *Hacon* requires theſe it ſeems before. It is true, 'God touches the heart, makes it new; the 'ſtrength of his grace overcoms its reluctancies, and rebellions, in-'clines it mildly, changes it gently, heals and raiſes it to a right 'temper. But though theſe be more then perſwaſion, yea, and more then faith, yet they are the operations of the holy Ghoſt, illuminating, and perſwading; and being conſequents of faith, are not the antecedents to its working. *Camero* ſaies, *Deus omnia iſta facit perſuadendo*; God doth all thoſe things by his perſwaſion.

Loco citato ſuperius.

Sect. 4.

Sect. 4. Well, but he will prove by two Arguments, faith is not produced by illumination, and perſwaſion only, in the heart of the ſinner. In the heart of the hearer ~~he doth~~ ſay I. But let us ſee his Arguments; they are, 1. 'They are far unable, corruption is 'ſo deeply rooted in mans nature, and ſuch his death in ſin, that 'though his underſtanding ~~being~~ inlightned, and his affections per-'ſwaded, yet if his heart and will be not renewed and changed, the work will ſtill be undone. *Reply*, Here be ſayings, but no proofes; and ſuppoſitions of what we grant not. Namely, that Gods Spirit by inlightning, and perſwading the hearer, doth only perſwade the affections, and let the heart, and will alone; Whereas I expreſly ſaid he perſwades the heart. So *Japheths*, and the Patriarks hearts were perſwaded, as their hearts and wills imbraced, and ſo were renewed and changed; for all theſe things God works by perſwading. But indeed the ground of his miſtake is diſcovered in what he ſays of perſwaſion and illumination, *viz.* That to perſwade, is but to preſent objects outwardly, which are lookt upon as the ſubject is diſpoſed; Whereas Gods perſwaſion diſpoſes alſo the ſubject, and makes the love of the World ſeem a *foul* love, and a Priſon for Chriſt *faire*. Yea, morall ſwaſion may do more then he ſays; at leaſt, Diabolical inticement did, to the inclining, and perverting, and ſo diſpoſing the heart of *Evah* to tranſgreſſion; And ſure God can do more by perſwaſion then Satan did. As for illumination, he ſays, 'Thats but an outward work, though wrought within 'man, yet externall to the heart of man, from without, foreinſecal, 'and therefore cannot much confer to the power of the ſoul, &c. *Reply*, Gods illumination alſo removes the blindneſs of the heart, wiſdom and knowledg entring into it, though the unperſwaſible let it in often, only to the head; as he ſuppoſes after, in ſuch as ſin a- Prov. 2. 20.
gainſt the holy Ghoſt. But me thinks Mr. *Hacon* argues ſtrangely; Should he reaſon Scholar like, and put his Argument here into Mood and Figure, one of his propoſitions muſt needs be this, That whatſoever is foreinſecal, or comes from without, can confer no great matter to the power of the ſoul. But then would I ſubjoyne (and I trow Mr. *Hacon* will not deny it) but the grace of God comes, though into man, yet from without, becauſe from God: Therefore, *actum eſt de homine*, grace cannot ſave him. I hope Mr. *Hacon* would here deny the firſt Propoſition, and ſo make inva-

invalid his own Argument. He adds, 'its not light, but eye-salve that must help the faculty, and recover the sight, carnally said, for Gods light is eye-salve too; his word is both, it gives *understanding to the simple*, Psal. 19. 7. and 119. 131. Its the *light of life*, John 8. 12.

2. His second Argument is, 'Suppose those two could do it, 'yet this were not enough to make good that faith is not of our 'selves, it is the gift of God, yea such a gift as is wrought by the ex-'ceeding greatness of his power, that power that raised Christ from 'the dead. *Rep.* This inference is denied and justly, for if both the inlightning and perswasion be none of ours, but of God, then what he works by it must needs be so too, for *causa causæ est causa causati*; which causes the cause, causes the effect, we use to say; and if of God, then what but a gift, seeing it is no reward of debt, nor nothing purchased or deserved by us? and if his gift, then why not by the exceeding greatnesse of his power, even that which wrought in Christ to raise him from the dead? what else causes the heart to see, and quickens it up to God that before lay dead? though those phrases in *Eph.* 1. 19. to which he alludes, speak rather of the power working in the believer (in us that believe) to uphold and carry him on against all oppositions, then of the first working faith in men; but let us see the reason he gives for this his inference: It is this, 'For what is done should chiefly be by the efficacy of 'the Object throughly laid open. *Rep.* Be it so, what doth that hinder, seeing the exceeding power of God is in that object, and lays it throughly open? as in 2 *Cor.* 3. 18. *beholding with open face the glory of God as in a glasse, we are transformed into the same likeness from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of God*: So the Gospel of Christ, is the power of God to salvation to every one that beleeves, *Rom.* 1. 16. yea, and to beget beleeving too, for it is the Word of Faith, from which heard Faith comes, *Rom.* 10. 8, 17. Christ crucified therein preacht, is both the power and wisdom of God, 1 *Cor.* 1. 22, 23. and if the Brazen Serpent lifted up had such force in it, through the presence of God with it, shall not Christ crucified being throughly laid open, have much more in it to heal the heart, then that to heal the body? *they that know Gods Name will trust in him*, Psal. 9. 10. the sight and knowledge of the Object begets the will to trust; so *John* 4. 9, 10. *Hadst thou known thou wouldst have asked*; and so a man

a man is born of God in a double reſpect; of God as diſcovered in Chriſt, his grace and glory manifeſted, the water in the Word; and of God a working in that manifeſtation, the agent and efficient, the Spirit; both together and in one, *John* 1. 13. and 3. 3. 5. Is Mr. *Hacon* a Teacher and Maſter in *Iſrael*, and doth not know theſe things? Is he ignorant of the power of that object diſcovered? the glory of the Father whereby Chriſt was raiſed, *Rom.* 6. 5. his fancy then of Satan inticing on the one hand, and God on the other perſwading, and the will as an impartial Judge between both, caſting the ſcales, is beſide the buſh; in actions to the means, as liſtning and hearing ſome ſuch things may be ſuppoſed, but not in the framing the will to beleeve, when in hearing the mind is inlightned, and the heart perſwaded; and this may ſuffice to that Exception.

Sect. 5. Only there are ſome ſtrange Inferences and miſtakes worthy to be noted, impertinently inſerted, *p.* 139. and cauſeleſly concluded there, and *p.* 142. as from my ſaying, *Open Door*, *p.* 141. whoſoever receiveth the light that comes from God, and walks therein, as God is in it affording power and ſtrength to him there-through; from thoſe words and no more, he infers as if I had ſaid: 1. 'All men 'within the Church are within the light there (in 1 *John* 1. 7.) ſpo-'ken of: And 2. that they walk in it that receive it, being preſent-'ed to them and met withall: And 3. that to walk in the light is 'to entertain the means that God affords to his Church univerſal-'ly as the light of the Sun is ſpread in the air. Yea, and 4. As if 'I implyed that God ſheds forth his ſpiritual beams, not by a voluntary diſpenſation, when, and how, and to whom he pleaſes; but (which muſt make one end of the ſtory almoſt every where) to all alike: Whereas thoſe words above quoted, intimate or ſignifie no one of all theſe his ſuggeſtions of me; nor are any of theſe his charges imputable to me, or came into my mind; he might as well from that of our Saviour, *John* 6. 40. that *whoſoever ſeeth the Son, and beleeves in him* have charged our Saviour with ſaying, That all men within the Church are within the ſight and faith of the Son and they that ſee him in any ſenſe beleeve in him; and all the reſt of thoſe Concluſions, or ſomewhat like them. He ſays, 'by light the Apoſtle 'means goodneſſe, and truth, and purity; as by darkneſs, ignorance 'and ſin, *he that hates his brother is in darkneſſe.* God grant Mr. *Hacon* and I be out of that darkneſſe, for I by light meant goodneſſe

and truth too, even that which is presented in the Gospel, *p.* 142. He faults my Phrase of *co-operation of the Holy Ghost*, 'as suggesting this 'unsound Divinity, as if a man did co-work with God in the 'first production of Faith, but no ground for it; for I spake of Gods co-operation with the means, or Gospel, and its Ministers, not with the man in whom he first works faith; the man hears only, and Gods Spirit makes him to beleeve: About which hearing I speak nextly, and about the power thereto said.

CHAP. XXVII.

Except. 26. *About the power of inward Hearing.*

AS the ability to hear the Gospel outwardly is of Gods gift, so the word outwardly heard brings to men by the gift of God power of more inward hearing and attention. I proved both parts from *Prov.* 20. 12. with *Rom.* 10. 17. he says the former place 'proves 'not, that any man is able to hear the Gospel outwardly, is the 'gift of God by nature, in whom we live, move, and have our 'beings. I leave that to the judgement of any that is rational and indifferent; for if the hearing ear be of God, the ability to hear the Gospel outwardly when it is preached, must needs be Gods gift; that the earth brings forth fruit of its self, is not in opposition to Gods gift, but *sponte, ultrò*, by a property put into it of God, without humane power to help it, after the corn or seed is lodged in it. I spake of hearing of a mans self, without or opposed to the receiving of it from God, and so no man hears outwardly, or inwardly of himself. He says, 'this is more then needs a 'Note below *Gammoth*, that we may know he is musical: Well, but its not below what the Spirit of God thought good to teach us, and therefore not unfit for children to be taught.

Mark 4. 28 *Injussa virescunt gramina.*

Sect. 2. He suspects he says (though he is here so more then usually civill as but to suspect) that I quit free will to gain universal 'grace, and that by *grace* I mean nothing but nature, for to hear 'outwardly is by nature, to hear inwardly is by grace, but both these

'these he says are in my Answer both alike, without any difference called Gods gift. *Rep.* Let the Reader view my Answer and judge of my Reviewers sight, or honesty when he thus wrote, where say I they are both alike, without any difference so called? nay, I say quite otherwise; for in saying of the latter, it is a gift brought to us by the Word of God, which I say not of the former; I expresly put a difference, and implyed that the latter is by grace, and acknowledge, that whether grace be particular or universal, it always adds something to nature, ~~super-added~~, and to natural endowments: 'That power to hear with inward intention, belongs to the internal vocation, I grant; but that it is not universal therefore follows not: Or that it is 'an act of special distinguishing grace, for if it were so, then why doth our Saviour fault some for stopping the ear lest they should hear; it was not the outward ear they stopt with their fingers, but their inward surely they stopt with their oppositions to God, and if that was not opened no ground to stop it, lest they should hear, *Matth.* 13. 15. a deaf man that can hear nothing, knows no reason to stop his ear against one voice more then another, though its true the inclining the heart to hear and obey, is a further work of grace, and follows upon the inclining the ear to hear what is outwardly said; so that universal grace is no whit disproved by any thing he can prove from Scripture hereabout.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Except. 27. *About falling from faith or grace.*

Sect. 1. POssible it is (said I *Ans.* 256.) for a man that hath beleeved to fall from his faith, and so from grace, if it be not well rooted in his heart, and the heart thereby kept single to God, and fruitful in good; but where these things are, no danger of falling. To which he says, 'He that 'would rightly answer this Question, should first distinguish true 'justifying faith from false unfound and temporary faith, and not 'speak of these two, as if they were all one, as he says they are

 spoke

ſpoken of in my Anſwer. *Rep.* 1. Faith and grace often ſignifie the Doctrine of faith, and the grace therein declared; ſo grace ſignifies in that ſaying, *Ye are fallen from grace*, Gal.5.4. Now no diſtinction here, of ſound and unſound ought to be made, for the doctrine of God, and ſo the grace therein is but one. 2. As for the way or manner of beleeving, which is often called Faith and a grace, I think I ſufficiently expreſt a ſound beleeving, and excluded an unſound falſe and temporary faith, for that is not ſuch as is rooted in the heart, and keeps it ſingle to God, and fruitful in good; ſo that there was diſtinction better then what he ſuggeſts.

*Sect.*2. He adds, 'ſuch a faith as is feined and unſound may be loſt, and truly I thinke its not worth the keeping, no loſſe in loſing ſuch a faith, ſeeing if kept, it would do a man no good; a man may loſe it for the better, even for a righter faith; but I am perſwaded that is not it, which the Apoſtles and Chriſt warn men of, and bewailed or feared any for, that they ſhould looſe what made them but hypocrites. 'True faith of a right kind (he ſays) is not loſt. *Rep.* If by faith he mean the doctrine of Faith, its clearly falſe; if the right beleeving, if ſuch as I deſcribed, no danger I ſaid of ſuch a mans falling as ſo beleeves, if all true Faith hath rooting, and is fruitful, and abideth; then my Anſwer ſaid all true Faith puts out of danger of falling, but what is that that is rooted? that muſt ſignifie the thing received; now Faith as its a thing received into the heart, is not the act of beleeving, (for that is its receiving, not the thing received) but the word or grace of God, ſo then by that ſaying muſt be ſignified, that the true ſeed or word is alwaies ſo received as to be rooted, fruitful, and abiding; but thats clearly falſe, *Gal.* 5. 4. *Matth.*13. and as falſe is it in that ſenſe to ſay, that falſe faith hath no rooting, is unfruitful and abides not, for many die in their falſe Faiths or perſwaſions, and do much hurt by their fruits: No, nor is it true of the act of beleeving, for the thorny ground was not a rightly beleeving ground, as to the manner of its beleeving, yet the ſeed was rooted and abide, but brought not forth fruit to perfection; therefore neither like I that addition to be put into my Anſwer, *Viz.* That ſuch 'Faith as from which any man doth fall, was never true Faith, even 'while he did ſtand therein; becauſe, 1. The Faith men ſtand in, 'is the word of Faith, the Faith beleeved, their beleeving is but

their

their ſtanding. 2. If that was never true faith that any fell from, then needed not the Apoſtles have endeavoured to bring any to riſe to it again, for why ſhould men riſe in any ſenſe to a falſe faith. 3. Even the way or manner of beleevingis ſometime ſuppoſed to have been ſo right as to bring them into Sonſhip, and to be in a juſtified and accepted ſtate, and yet ſuch believers ſuppoſed in danger of falling, if not actually fallen, and that ſo as Chriſt would profit them nothing. Such were the *Galathians*. They ran well, were the Sons of God by faith in Chriſt, had the Spirit of the Son, and cried Abba Father; they knew God, or rather were known of God, yet the Apoſtle ſays of them, he was afraid of them, they were aboliſhed from Chriſt, ſo many of them as were juſtified by the Law, they were fallen from grace; which argues too, that they ſometime had a being in Chriſt, and in his grace. The temporary believer is not ſaid to have wanted truth of faith, but root. The fooliſh Virgins had oile in their lamps, elſe how could their lamps have burned or gone out? but they took not oyle in their veſſels to ſupply their lamps, they treaſured not up the Word of God in their hearts. The houſe that fell had no good foundation, becauſe they did not do what they heard. I ſay not then, that none that fall away were hypocrites before, but that all that fall away were not alwayes ſo before they fell, and that I think is proved abundantly from the *Galathians*.

Sect. 3 He notes, "that the Apoſtles ſpeaking of Apoſtates, do uſually "put a difference preſently after betwixt them, even while they "ſtood, and true believers, leſt the believers ſhould take offence, & be "diſcouraged, and ſuſpect themſelves, in no better condition then the "Apoſtates while they continued. *Rep.* 1. That they put a difference betwen Apoſtates and true believers uſually I grant: yea, and between them and what the Apoſtates were and did for ſome time before their open revolt: but that they put ſuch a difference as to imply that none of them were ever other then hypocrites, never true believers: I cannot yield. 2. Its obſervable on the other hand, and more clearly provable, that they uſually, after mention of the Apoſtates, warne the true believers one and other to look to themſelves, and take heed of ſuch things as occaſioned their fall, as implying no ſuch impoſſibility of any of their falling, but that by ſloth, careleſneſſe, and receiving in ſuch evil roots and principles as they did, they may fall alſo. 3. What need of either warning them (the true believers of

ſuch

ſuch things, and to take heed of falling from their ſtedfaſtneſſe, as 2 *Pet.* 3.17,18. or of fearing their diſcouragement, and offence taking, as he ſuppoſes, in caſe they had not put ſuch difference as he ſays, if they were out of all danger of taking offence and falling, as he implies.

Sect. 4. He quotes to prove his former obſervation divers Scriptures, which all more clearly prove mine then his. Let us view them.

1. His firſt is, 2 *Theſ.* 2.10,11,12. where there is oppoſition between the abiding believers, and thoſe who believed not the truth, or received not the love of it, that they might be ſaved, who therefore was left to deluſions, that they might periſh from it. Where by *believing* and *receiving* the truth may be ſignified either, that they never did ſo heartily, as many ſuch without doubt there be, or that they did ſlack in ſo doing, and not continue ſo to do, and ſo for ſome time before their Apoſtacy did not ſo. As in Scripture, men that believed or did righteouſneſſe for ſome time, and did not continue, are reckoned as not doing it at all; becauſe turning from it, all that which they did ſhall not be mentioned; as in *Ezek.* 18. 24. and 33.13. ſo the Iſraelites who believed his words, and ſang his praiſe, *Pſal.* 106.13. and yet ſoon after forgat his works, and turned from their believing, are ſaid to be deſtroyed for their not believing, *Jude* 5. *Heb.* 3.18. But its obſervable again, that in 2 *Theſ.* 2.13,14. though he ſay God had choſen the abiding believers, from the beginning, through (or in) the ſanctification of the Spirit, &c. yet he warnes them *ver.* 14. to ſtand faſt, and keep the traditions or ordinances delivered to them, as implying, that was the way to be kept in the grace to which they were choſen, as *Deut.* 7.6,7. the Lord ſet his love on *Iſrael*, and choſe them; yet he ſays, if they hearken to Gods judgments, and keep and do them, then the Lord would keep his Covenant to them, and would love (that is, go on to love) them, *ver.* 11.12,13. but if at all they forgat the Lord (or rather as *Beza* reads *omnino obliti fuerint*, they altogether forgat him) they ſhould ſurely periſh, even as the Heathen, *ch.* 8.19,20. So the Apoſtle implies, that if thoſe believers ſtood not faſt, and obſerved the ordinances delivered to them, they might poſſibly fall into like deluſions as the others; however he gives them no aſſurance or intimation, that though they ſlighted thoſe things, yet

they

they could not miscarry; no more then he took to himself such a perſwaſion of himſelf, 1 *Cor.* 9.27.

2. His ſecond is, 2*Tim.*2.19. which ſays not the building ſtands ſure, or every ſtone of it, otherwiſe then in cleaving to the foundation. But the foundation ſtands ſure, *viz.* Chriſt as laid in the Apoſtles doctrine, (as we noted before) having (namely the foundation hath) this Seal, the Lord knoweth them that are his, that is, the foundations, and ſo Gods. God ownes τὰς ὄντας αὐτοῦ, them that are his, but then he preſently admoniſhes them all. Let every one that nameth the Name of Jeſus depart from iniquity, as implying the want of that overthrew *Hymenens* and *Philetus*, and the faith of others was ſubverted, by not keeping them far off from their evil doctrines; and therefore, that if any of the yet ſtanding believers did not take heed to depart from evil, they might be left too; for in not departing from iniquity, they departed from the foundation, and became none of its or his, and ſo departed from under the ſeal of it, Gods owning or knowing them. Thence alſo that admonition, *ver.* 21. if any man cleanſe himſelf from theſe, he ſhall be a veſſel to honour, &c. yea, and *Timothy* himſelf is not ſpared, he muſt flie alſo youthful luſts, otherwiſe no aſſurance of his perſeverance, *ver.* 22.

3. His next is, *Heb* 6.9. the believing Hebrews are oppoſed to thoſe that bring forth briars and thornes, *ver.* 8. who were near to curſing, in eminent hazard of being given up to Apoſtacie, in oppoſition to thoſe, the Hebrews had better things, namely, then briars and thornes, hoped of by the Apoſtle concerning them, things ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας, accompanying ſalvation: or (as *Ariſtotle* uſes ſuch a phraſe ἐχόμενον τούτων as a conſequence of theſe things) things following upon, or ſuitable to ſalvation, that is, to the ſalvation or ſaving doctrine or grace of God received: and ſo things that Gods ſalvation or ſaving protection to keep them from falling, was engaged by him to, as 2 *Pet.* 1.10. *If ye do theſe things ye ſhall never fall.* Mr. *Hacons* mention of true grace here implies, there is ſome falſe grace which the Scripture never mentions. All Gods grace is true without queſtion, but yet the Apoſtle wiſhes theſe true believers to go on and ſhew the ſame diligence (in which at preſent they were under Gods ſalvation) to the full aſſurance of hope to the end, and not be ſlothful, *ver.* 11, 12. yea, and in *chap.* 3. and 4. and 10. and 12.

Arist. 10 li. lib. 2. cap. 3. Act. 28. 28.

warnes theſe very believers to take heed of thoſe things that occaſioned other mens falling, and provokes them to diligence in the grace of God, and meanes of it, as holding faſt the Profeſſion of their faith, not forſaking the aſſemblings of themſelves, &c. and in ſo doing aſſures them of the enjoyment of Gods Promiſes, which he hath engaged himſelf in, by word and oath, and is faithful to performe, *Heb.* 6,13.——18. and 10.23, 24 25. but implies no ſuch thing or thought, that either thoſe that fell never had true grace, or that thoſe who truly believe may not by any neglect let ſlip out of their minde the things they had heard, or wilfully depart from God, but implies the contrary of them, even of himſelf alſo, if not diligent and watchful. How ſhall we eſcape if we neglect ſo great ſalvation, *Heb.*2.1,2,3 and if we ſin wilfully, *Heb.*10.25,26.

4. His fourth is, *Heb.*10. the two laſt verſes, which he miſreades, for the words are not in the Greek, *If any man,* but ἐαν ὑποστειλεται, *if he draw back, my ſoul ſhall have no pleaſure in him*: *If he,* that is, the juſt man, as in *Ezek.*33.13. ſuch a righteous man as God ſays to, *thou ſhalt ſurely live,* that is, whom God juſtifies and promiſes life to (which he never doth to any falſe believer, or that hath but falſe grace) if he truſting in his own righteouſneſſe, (*viz.* that he is a juſt and juſtified man) ſhall preſume to do iniquity, he ſhall die. Whence the Apoſtle warnes ſuch not to be high-minded, but fear, *Rom.* 11. 20,22. "That to believe, and to draw back, are contrary and incon-
"ſiſtent] none can doubt: but that the ſame ſubject is capable of doing contrary things at ſeveral times, is as doubtleſſe, he that did righteouſneſſe may come to draw back.

His next is, 2*Pet.*2.22. "The dog is turned to his own vomit,
" and the Swine that was waſhed, to wallow in the mire. Whence
" he notes, that though they were reformed and waſhed outwardly,
" yet they ſtill remained what they were, and their nature continuing
"cauſed this return. A ſheep differs from a ſwine newly waſht. So
"a true Convert from a falſe. *Rep.* That there be ſome only pretenders, never right believers, is without queſtion, and of ſuch all that he ſays may be granted; yet that thoſe perſons mentioned were all ſuch, and never better, follows not thence. Swine waſhed with the waſhing of regeneration become ſheep; and what waſhing theſe had elſe, who had eſcaped the pollutions (falſe doctrines, idols, and evil ways) of the world, through the knowledge of our Lord and Sa-

viour

viour Jeſus Chriſt (like that in *Tit.* 3. 4, 5, 6, 7.) is not eaſily ſhewed; or that theſe were none of them waſht therewith, yet by withdrawing from Gods grace wherewith they were ſo waſht, and in which is the new man, and new nature, both to be put on and continued in, they might degenerate again to their old condition, and become dogs and ſwine; yea, worſe then before, and being ſwine before their waſhing, and when they wallowed in the mire, and returning to be ſwine again, before they wallow again in the mire, and ſo having ceaſed to be ſheep, that Proverb might be fitly applied to them; there being no ſuch waſhing or metamorphiſing cleanſing in nature, as from a dog or ſwine to a ſheep, as there is in grace, the ſimilitude is not to be ſtrained; for then a man might conclude that ſuch as are dogs and ſwines muſt needs periſh, they cannot be converted, regenerated, and ſaved, and ſo that there is no regeneration. As the Poet ſtories of *Ulyſſes*, men inchanted into ſwine, and thence uninchanted again into men: So the Prodigal ſeems to have been ſpiritually, by that phraſe, *Luke* 15. 17. *when he came to himſelf again*: And *Aſaph* implies that by his ſtumbling at the wickeds proſperity he was almoſt become a beaſt, *Pſal.* 73. 22 However evident it is, that the Apoſtle warns the true beleevers, *Chap.* 3. 17. to take heed, leſt being *drawn away by the error of the wicked, they ſhould fall from their own ſtedfaſtneſſe*, &c. and therefore doth not ſuppoſe them to be ſo inconvertibly ſheep, that they could never by any neglect of grace, or ſinning againſt God degenerate into ſwine with the wicked.

6. His laſt is, 1 *John* 2 19. and 5. 19. the former ſhews that (which I always grant) the Apoſtates were before their open going out, inwardly departed from the true beleevers, and went out that they might be manifeſted to be ſo; but it proves not, that ſuch as were firſt not of them in heart, and then afterward departed were never at any time of the true beleevers; even as if a man ſay, when he ſees a degenerate vine bring forth four grapes, he may ſay this was a bad tree before it brought forth theſe four grapes, otherwiſe ſure it would have brought forth good fruit; yet it follows not thence that that degenerate vine was never a noble plant, as *Jer.* 2. 21. the Apoſtle preſently after admoniſhes the true beleevers therefore, to let that which they had heard from the beginning abide in them, and ſo they ſhould continue in the Father and Son, as implying, o-

therwiſe not; *verſ.* 24. which alſo is expreſt, 2 *John* 9. So in the other place, it is not ſaid, that he who ſins to death was never a true brother; nor that thoſe that are born of God may never degenerate and ſin; but at the preſent he ſinneth not: *a good tree cannot bring forth evill fruit, conjunctim*, and at the ſame time; it follows *verſ.* 21. *Babes, keep your ſelves from idols*; as implying, it was both poſſible for them to defile themſelves with them, and that ſo to do might be deſtructive to them. Theſe two things then are generally hinted in ſuch places. 1. That the Apoſtates before their open departure were corrupt at heart, not that they were always ſo. 2. That it behoves the ſtedfaſteſt beleevers to take heed of preſuming upon their ſtedfaſtneſſe, and infallibleneſſe, ſo as to neglect the grace of God, leſt they alſo growing corrupt at heart, fall after the ſame example of unbeleef, as *Heb.* 4. 11. but the Apoſtles ever aſſure men, that in taking heed to the grace of God, and walking diligently in his ways, they ſhould be kept from falling, which confirms my Anſwer, that the heart rooted in grace, and kept ſingle and fruitful in good, is out of danger; otherwiſe not.

CHAP. XXIX.

Except. 28. *About the Will of God.*

Sect. 1. KEeping Gods holy will I ſaid *Qu.* and *Anſw.* 272. we are bound to by our Baptiſm, and that the Will of God is that I ſhould be ſaved, and come to the acknowledgment of the truth: Or as in my other Edition, our ſanctification and ſalvation. Here he ſays, 'Will is ſometime command, ſometime intention: I took it to ſignifie the former in 1 *Tim.* 2. 4. Mr. *Hacon* the latter: That God doth will, or intend, or purpoſe to ſave all men, I ſaid not, nor doth the Apoſtle: Biſhop *Davenant* might have minded him of a difference between *Volo omnes homines ſalvos facere, & volo omnes homines ſalvos fieri*: I will ſave all men, and I will all men to be ſaved; that then is a great miſtake, and no matter of either faith or practiſe, as he wrongly

ly ſays, to ſave is active, to be ſaved is paſſive. I was not ſo ſilly as to talk of keeping Gods holy intention or his action; but of obſerving his will concerning us, and to be done by us; which is, that we *look to him, and be ſaved*, Iſai. 45.22.

Sect. 2. He gives his gloſs on that Text, 1 *Tim* 2.4. thus, 'That 'S. *Paul* ſhews the reaſon there why he would have all Kings and 'worldly powers prayed for, more then in former times, becauſe 'God now intended to inlarge the limits of his Church, and ſhew 'mercy to all the world, excluding no Nation or people; That 'whereas there is one God Creator of all mankind, there ſhould 'now be acceſſe to him for all people, &c. *Rep.* Did not *Abraham* pray for the Kings and people of the five Cities before, and *Moſes* for *Pharaoh*, and the people of *Iſrael* for *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Darius*, &c. and was not Gods houſe a houſe of prayer for all people, *Iſai.*56.7,8. But 2. I am glad to find Mr. *Hacon* ſuch an Univerſaliſt now, as to allow acceſſe to God for all men by Chriſt; but it ſeems more in his words, then it is in reality beleeved by him, ſeeing he hath told us God gives them not that whereby they may come; and to open the door for a lame cripple that neither can ſtir hand nor foot, and to allow him no ſuccour to help him in, is next nothing as to his entring: But he ſays, 'God is to be 'worſhipped in Spirit and truth now, and not as before Chriſts 'coming in outward Rites, Shadows, and Ceremonies, which then 'bare a great part of Gods ſervice. I am glad Mr. *Hacon* is for ſuch ſpiritual worſhip, if it be in reality; for he may have its likely a ſecret intention contrary to his revealed ſayings, as he ſignifies of God; but were not the Ceremonies of Gods appointing then, more warrantable and ſuitable to *Davids* ſpiritual worſhip, then Rites or Ceremonies of mans inſtitution now, that God never commanded? might not a man expect more bleſſing then in obſerving them, then in the other now? I durſt not determine poſitively, for fear I find Mr. *Hacon* a greater friend to them then his words might pretend.

Sect. 3. But to come to the main of his Exception: He ſays, Gods 'will is not in that place his command; and to be ſaved matter of 'reward, not of work, and to come to the knowledge of the truth, 'is not to beleeve, but to be made partakers of the Goſpel by pub-'lication: No command to the Nations to receive it, till it 'was brought to them, and they did come to the knowledge of

it. *Rep.* 1. But we have but his Assertion for all this, no proof; That God commands us to be saved, I prove from *Isai.* 45. 22. 2. The word in the Original translated knowledge, is ἐπίγνωσις; the acknowledgment rather, as I take it, and that's a duty; and so it is to receive the Gospel as it is brought to us; and I did not imply it is any otherwise to be received: 'But may the Univer-'salists say (suggests he) If it be indeed the will of God (that is, 'his intention) that all be saved, then is not salvation limited to 'some only called the Elect. Well propounded, let us see how he will shift himself from the force of it: He assays to do it by a thred-bare distinction, never well proved by them as they apply it: *Viz.* That 'Gods will (that is, his intention, we must hold him to that, else he will start from it, and prevaricate) 'is twofold. 1. Revea-'led and conditional, and so he wills (that is intends still) that all 'be saved. 2. Secret and absolute, so he willeth only a few to be sa-'ved.] I allow this distinction better, that conditionally he wills or intends only the salvation of all; that is, if they receive his grace to be saved by it, but absolutely intends only the salvation of the belee-ver, or receiver of his grace, to speak of the *adulti* or grown persons; but both these are revealed, the first in *Ezek.* 33. 13. *Rev.* 22. 17. the o-ther *Joh.* 6. 41. *Mar.* 16. 16. But let us see how he makes good his distin-ction; he endeavours it by this similitude. 'A Nobleman, Lord to ma-ny decayed Tenants, deeply indebted to him, willeth them to pay what they owe him, otherwise to be ejected; [before we go further, what means Mr. *Hacon* by willeth there? doth it signifie intendeth? thats non-sense, or at least not agreeing with what follows, doubt-lesse he means commandeth, and so he stumbles at the entrance, and justifies my acceptation of the word which he condemned; but let 'him go on] to some few of them, formerly his menial servants, he 'sendeth supplies and enableth them to discharge their arrears, (but 'how, if notwithstanding that, they will not) against the rest the 'law passeth (yes, and against the former too, if they will not, though enabled) 'the Landlords will now is, that all his Tenants should 'pay their rents (whats his will there? his intention? when he knows the rest cannot, and he takes no care that they may have any help to it; who but Mr. *Hacon* will say so? Sure his will there must be his command to pay their debts) enjoy their houses and 'lands as formerly, and that none of them should be dispossessed

or

or impriſoned (who elſe will ſay that this landlord intended any ſuch thing as all this, any more then God intended the Devils ſhould be ſaved, that is, in caſe they can do, what they neither can nor will give ſatisfaction to his juſtice by their repentance and otherwiſe:) He adds, and it is his will alſo that a few (but a few he ſhould have ſaid) ſhould certainly hold poſſeſſion (that is, whether they will pay when enabled, or not) though moſt of them be 'caſt out: Of theſe two he ſays, the firſt is conditional: [A conditional intention (well, let that be remembred that our *contra-Remonſtrant* adverſaries now at length, grant a conditional will or intention in God, which hitherto many of them have ſtifly impugned (but upon an impoſſible condition; and ſo I will ſay of ſuch a landlord, what I abhor to think of God; a meer pretence in ſtead of an intent,] *Viz.* upon their performance and payment of what he knew they could not: the ſecond is abſolute, becauſe accompanied with his power and purſe, (and yet might never be done, if they were not as well willing, as inabled to do it) ſuch his ſimilitude very lame and defective, and not to be accommodated to Gods willing and doing; for ſuppoſe now, ſuch a Landlord ſhould alledge the payment made him by thoſe his menial ſervants againſt the other, and bring them in againſt them to condemn them, as doing better then they did (as God will the penitent againſt the impenitent, *Matth.* 12.41,42.) would it not be a notable injuſtice and diſſimulation of him? Might not the other juſtly plead, no reaſon they ſhould condemn us, ſeeing they had that help and ability we had not, and which had we had, we ſhould have done as well as they did? far be it from us to think ſo wickedly of God. I may conclude with him indeed, 'If this ſimilitude be right and reaſon, 'and plain to be underſtood, then we have no cauſe to ſay, they de-'ny or miſ-interpret that Scripture, ſaying, *God willeth all men to be 'ſaved*; but if that be right and reaſon, never any man was abſurd; and ſo his Concluſion recoyls upon him to his condemnation: Sure thats as far from the right as his cloſe is, *That men are by their own default held faſt in the bands of infidelity*, when as yet by their principles, *Adam* threw them inevitably into it, (all ſin (he ſays) being the product of their original ſin) and Chriſt did nothing to relieve them, becauſe he procured not faith for them, without which all the reſt is nothing to the breaking thoſe bands from off them.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXX.

Exception 29. *Unbeleevers of Gods grace no right Worshippers.*

LAstly, He faults my six last Answers, but rather reviles and falsifies them only, then says any thing worth Animadversion against them; 'as that I cen-'sure well nigh all Christians, as if they were 'false Worshippers, unbelievers, and void of true 'Religion, because they refuse what I tender them; *Reply.* If the time of Beast-worshipping be not over (as many godly persons think it is not) then the Scripture says the whole earth or world, all that dwell upon the earth are false worshippers, those only excepted whose names are written in the Lambs book of life, *Rev.* 13.3.8. But if that time be past, yet its false, that I charged any as such for refusing what I tender, but for refusing what God says and tenders, and they that do so are no better then I said; *Viz.* That such give God the lie; which words do as verily belong to those that deny any truth of God, much more that beleeve not truths of a fundamental usefulness, as to those to whom he would limit them, *Viz.* Persons guilty of wilful infidelity (is there any such, and not necessitated for want of Gods giving faith?) denying Christ made known, &c. they are persons persisting in their unbelief, and rejecting the material truths of the Gospel offered, that I applyed both that, and all the other sayings too; but whereas he would inlarge them no farther then to such as refuse to be baptized, he is evidently in an error; for were not those false teachers baptized, or those seduced *Galatbians*, of whom the Apostles implied, that they made void Christs death, and Gods grace; and those in 1 *John* 5. 10. were they only open enemies, or also false Christians that the Apostles wrote against? I have therefore spoken therein nothing that I know to be false: God grant it be not found true concerning many more, then Mr. *Hacon* judges it may be said of; but I have done, I shall only adde;

The Concluſion.

Upon review of his whole work I think I may boldly pronounce,

Nil fecit tanto dignum hic promiſſor hiatu.
His gaping did ſome wondrous thing portend,
But nothing like thereto is found i'th end.

Though his condemnatory ſentence was very peremptory and harſh, yet it fares with it as with other over-haſty ſentences, it wants in the proof, what it had too much in the pronouncing. I hope after due tryal, I may ſafely judge my ſelf never the worſe a Catechiſt for his reviewing it; yea, I may fairlier paſſe my Verdict now on his Review in the cloſe, then he could of my Catechiſe in his beginning; and this it is:

It is a well printed and well cloſured piece, fraught with pretty reading, and a good neat ſtrain and ſtile; but I want in it three things: *Viz.* Logick, Ethicks, and Theology; or Reaſon, Honeſty and Truth: Reaſon, becauſe his argumentations are ſo looſe jointed and inconſequent, as if he were a ſtranger to Logick, they hang together like an ill ordered Army ſoon put to the rout; honeſty, becauſe he is ſo frequent in miſtaking, falſifying, abuſing and ſlandering me, and ſometimes odiouſly. Truth or Divinity, becauſe his Principles ſo often diſagree from the doctrine of the Scriptures. I confeſs it hath not failed me in the expectation of his learning, if various reading, and good wording may be ſo called: But it faileș much in what I looked for, of ingenuity, candor, and neighbourly reſpect; he hath dealt with me I think rather like an enemy then a neighbour, yet God forbid, I ſhould not love and pray for him, though I ſee he want charity; yea ſhould he yet become more (as I hope not) my enemy. I pray God help him to ſee the evill of his way, and the hurt that that too much and high thoughts of himſelf and prejudice againſt his neighbour may do unto him. I cannot but think ſome prejudices againſt my perſon (I know not wherefore being ſo meer a ſtranger to him) hath clouded his reaſon: I conceive his abilities are very good were he out of diſtemper; both the time of his putting forth this Review, as alſo its language beſpeaks a Caution of him to me, and a prayer to God for him, either to make him more my friend, or to keep me from giving any

colour of advantage to him againſt me. But yet I hope a groundleſſe prejudice, and miſ-byaſſed zeal, was the cauſe of much of his miſcarriage, and that upon ſight of his miſtakes, he will be ſorry that he hath ſo injured me. The Lord pardon what is amiſſe in us both, and frame us both to his holy mind, and ſo to more unity and agreement therein with one another, and cauſe his truth to ſhine out more clearly by all the oppoſition it meets with from men or Sathan; yea whither the clearly ſhining of it diſcover mi-ſtakes in me or him: *Errare poſſum quia errare eſt humanum, Hæreticus eſſe nollem quia cupio veritatem*. Let Gods name be hallowed, that his Kingdom may come, and his will be done in earth as it is in heaven, is my prayer and petition, and ſo it is of every good Chriſtian. I conclude all with a paſſage or two of St. *Auſtin*, *Librum iſtum jam tandem aliquando precatione melius quam diſputatione concludam, Domine Deus quæcunq; dixi in his chartis de tuo agnoſcant & tui; ſi qua de meo & tu ignoſce & tui.* What is of thine Lord, in theſe my writings, let thine ſee to be truth and own: What ever is of mine and not thine, let thou and thine pardon. *Amen.*

FINIS.

The ERRATA.

I first correct my self in p.1.l.28. *ubi erratum est aliquantùm à chartis tuis*, in an ugly paenthesis, *quæ culpa vel festinatæ vel fervente nimiùm excidit*, *quæ* (*& si quid aliud ejusdem generis in illis sit*) *delatur*: the rest I desire the Reader to look upon as the too unfortunate, as well as too frequent miscarriages of the Press: as,

Page 1. line 15 for or: read as l.p.2.l.2.r. nec l.4 at l. *put an interrogation.* l.12 r. *to serve religion.* l.13. *a full stop at speaking.* l.15. r. *stand.* l.23. *a full stop at deprecate.* l.24 r. *we*, for *they* p.3.l.4. *put the comma after go* l.28. r. *Leoryhadis.* p.4.l.16. *?* for *:* l.22 *put the comma after all.* p.5.l.26. *there is* in for *is.* p.6.l.37. *put out their.* p.7 l.1. r. *towards.* and *servers*, and *in the margin.* r. *conjectim* p.10.l.11.r. *&c* l.25. *put out the stop at account.* p.12.l.20.r. *visible.* Chap.21.r. *adde this, at the end of the line.* p.14. l.35.r. *inclination.* p.15.l.19. for *but* r. *to*, and *in the margin singulo* for *singulo* p.17.l.12.r. *and will* and l.28. *put the comma after only.* and l.25. *a full stop at thing.* p.18.l.19.r *fetus.* and l.22 *obscured.* l.23 *civil: humor.* p.19.l.9 *put out the comma at maintains. and put a Parenthesis before nor, and after true.* l.33. *put out up.* p.22.l.33.r. *understood.* p.23.l.4.r. *vee.* p.25.l.1.r. *as* l.23. r. *have not the such.* p.27.l.13. for *too* r. *to.* p.31.l.29. *put out the former w* of l.32. r. *presse.* p.33.l.5.r. *through.* p.36.l.3. *put a full stop at blasphemy.* l.13.r. *gradi.* l *penult. blot out the latter* that. p.50.l.20. *blot out* For. *which should have been in the margin.* l.23.r. *like.* l. *last.* r. *imply.* p.51.l.4. & 7. *put out the full stops.* p.52.l.32.r. *annis.* p.57.l.31. *put a full stop at other* and l.32.r. *non electi.* p.58.l.16 r. for *all.* p.62.l.9. *put a full stop at them.* and l.20.r. *against.* p.65.l.26. for *bring*:r. *move.* l.28 for *none*:r. *now:* p.67.l.2 r. *significant.* p.69.l.30.r. *in us.* p.70 l.12. *put out the full stop at God.* p.71.l.4 r: *usuall.* l: 6. *put out in:* l:33:r: *chosen to.* p:72:l:19:r: *a praexist, and in the margin* r: *aterna electio.* p: 75:l:20:r: *preceeded.* p:79 :l. 30:r: *gives.* and l:31:r: *says.* p:83 :l:3 and 4:r: *decreet.* l.10 *distinct* p 84.l.18.r. *by him.* p.88.l.14. put out *it. shews.* l.30. for *chose*, r. *those.* p.91.l.35. for *sin*, r. *in.* p.92.l.32. for *this*, r. *thus.* l.35. r. *use of.* l.38. for *the*, r. *they.* p.94 l.19.r. *dishonour.* p.95.l. *last. put out the former in.* p.96.l.37.r. *are very.* p.101.l.3.r. *non effect.* p.105.l. *last.* r. *of God.* p.106.l.16.r. *knew him not.* and in the margin, r. *Deus misericordis sus, &c.* p.108.l. *anaep. put a stop after wherefore.* p.109.l.13. *put a full stop at not.* p.110.l.22.r. *to.* p.111.l.1.r. *is it.* p.114.l.20. *put out* their eyes. p.117.l.23.r. *that are.* and l.24 *put the halfe colon after election.* and l.27. *after others.* p.118.l.10. for *they*, r. *my. and put the comma at duties* p.121. in the margin, *there is* יתן, for יהן. and that also set nine lines higher then it ought. and l.31. there is the word (*not*) too much. p.122.l.8 for *swas* r. *was.* and l.9. *o.* for *so.* p.118. as is misspaged, for it should be p.124.l.27. for *alike*, r. *unlike.* p.126.l.2. for *his*, r. *God.* p.129.l.3. *it is he doth*, for *it is.* and l.6. for *being*, r. *be.* p.130.l.13. it should be, *that which*, p.131.l.2. for *a.* r. *is.* p.136. l.18 r. *at all.* p.138.l.25.r. *is as doubtlesse.* p.142.l.17. there is (*only*) too much. p.143.l.4. put a colon at *will.*

Cum multis aliis (præcipuè proh pudor! in punctis) quæ lectori inter legendum & observanda & corrigenda relinquo. *With this following request.*

Ne, quæso, impingas mihi, Lector, plurima quæ sunt
Vocibus & punctis σφάλματα χαλκοῦ ῥαφῆ.
Sœpe mihi indignanti ingens dolor ista fuere;
Ergo ea ne carpas; ὀφθογεγραφῆς δὲ γεγραῆς.

Charge me not with what I could not prevent,
Without too great a charge, again to Print.
It greiv'd mee when my Antagonist was foild,
To see my labours in the Presse so spoild.
Truth's laid in coursest sheetes, and fowlly prest,
While falshood finely lies and's neatly drest,
'Tis truth's hard hap to be so coursly handled,
While what opposes it, is hug'd and dandled.
But wonder not, for how can it be other?
This World's truth's Stepdame, but 'tis falshoods Mother.

Dis-

Diſtinguiſh right, not dreſſe but matter minde:
My Anſwer then ſufficient thou wilt finde.

Lege cum compoſitis, perlege, relege, intellige, dillige.
Si quid meliùs dictum ſit elige. Sin minùs, neglige.
Πάντα δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε.

Lord help us ſo to minde our faults as mend them:
What graces we do want, Lord ſee and ſend them.
Chriſts Church, our King, and Kingdom, God defend
With truth and peace. Heav'n be to us ——

THE END.